

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A Platform for the Free Discussion of
Issues in the Field of Religion and
Their Bearing on Education

OCTOBER-DECEMBER, 1941



Plans for 1942

Laird T. Hites

Religion in the Educational Experience of
Children and Youth: A Syllabus

Harrison S. Elliott

Religious Education, But Not in Public
Schools

G. George Fox

Eighty Hours More for Teaching Religion

Emerson O. Bradshaw

What We Do in Conferences

Lewis A. Dexter

Administration of Religion in the Liberal
Arts College: A Theory of Religious In-
tegration

L. L. Leftwich

Education, Economics and Democracy: A
Review

Ross W. Sanderson

Book Reviews

Index to Religious Education, 1941

Religious Education

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without official endorsement of any sort.

Articles in *Religious Education* are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX, which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$4.00 or more per year, of which \$3.50 is for subscription to the Journal. Single copies, \$1.00 each.

LAIRD T. HITES, Editor

*Department of Psychology and Education,
Central YMCA College, Chicago*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

FRANK M. MCKIBBEN, *Professor of Religious Education, Northwestern University, Chairman.*

WILLIAM C. BOWER, *Professor, University of Chicago.*

RUFUS D. BOWMAN, *President, Bethany Biblical Seminary, Chicago.*

HEDLEY S. DIMOCK, *Dean, George Williams College, Chicago.*

PERCY R. HAYWARD, *Chairman of Editorial Board, International Council of Religious Education, Chicago.*

LEO L. HONOR, *Executive Secretary, Board of Jewish Education, Chicago.*

REGINA WESTCOTT WIEMAN, *Consulting Psychologist and Lecturer, Chicago.*

The Religious Education Association

Publication Office, 404 N. Wesley Ave., Mount Morris, Ill.
Editorial Office, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Illinois

(Address all correspondence to the Editorial office)

Published quarterly. Printed in U. S. A.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XXXVI

OCTOBER-DECEMBER, 1941

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

	Page
Plans for 1942.....	Laird T. Hites 193
Religion in the Educational Experience of Children and Youth: A Syllabus.....	Harrison S. Elliott 195
Religious Education, but not in Public Schools.....	G. George Fox 212
Eighty Hours More for Teaching Religion.....	Emerson O. Bradshaw 220
What We Do in Conferences.....	Lewis A. Dexter 228
Administration of Religion in the Liberal Arts College: A Theory of Religious Integration.....	L. L. Leftwich 234
Education, Economics and Democracy: A Review.....	Ross W. Sanderson 245
Book Reviews.....	248
Index to Religious Education, 1941	

Entered as second-class matter July 31, 1935, at the post office at Mount Morris, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

PLANS FOR 1942

PLANS FOR THE FELLOWSHIP—

WE publish a journal, it is true, and we want to make it a good one. But *it is the journal of a fellowship of men and women who are enthusiastically engaged at a common task: making religion a vital force in life.*

These men and women, scattered over the face of the nation, are organized into regional chapters. Independently organized and locally administered, they meet on occasion for fellowship and for the consideration of their common problems. Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles, Cleveland, Florida, New England are representative centers.

Professor Ernest J. Chave, the Chairman of our Executive Committee, is just completing a series of visits to a dozen or more of the fellowship chapters of the Association. He reports keen interest all along the line.

On May 2, 3 and 4 we shall meet in annual convention. Those who can, from the various chapters, will assemble somewhere between Chicago and New York City for two and a half days of solid study of how to make religion meaningful in life, and will lay plans for the next year of work in the Association. Fellowship is always rich at these annual meetings, and we return to our home tasks stimulated and refreshed, with clearer outlooks and reinforced zeal.

JOURNAL CONTENT—

For the past two years we have been canvassing the inter-relationships possible between religious education and public education. The Editorial Committee plans to continue this exploration, but on a little wider plane. "Religion in the total educational experience of children, youth, and adults" is the way it might now be phrased.

This, of course, means religious education for children of elementary public school age integrated in some manner with their educational experience. It means the same thing at the high school level; and it implies a continuous study of that most baffling of problems—how to educate college and university students so they will emerge from school life religiously informed and religiously minded young men and women. At least three major articles during the year will consider the religious education of that host of men and women who have completed their formal education and taken their places in business, industry, and professional life.

The contents of this issue, the last for 1941, illustrate the scope of the problem as we shall approach it.

MORE JOURNAL—

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION will be published in six issues during 1942. An increase in the number of members, who automatically receive the JOURNAL, plus a significant increase in the number of library subscriptions, plus a number of special contributions to take up the slack, have encouraged the Executive Committee of our Board of Directors to authorize the publication of two more issues a year. For the past five years publication has been quarterly.

Members and subscribers will thus receive fifty percent more JOURNAL for their money. No increase in fees is contemplated.

The Association invites like-minded men and women, of any and all religious faiths, to join with us in the fellowship. You, active members, are urged to extend an invitation to them.

LAIRD T. HITES, *Editor*

RELIGION IN THE EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH

A Syllabus*

HARRISON S. ELLIOTT**

THE Religious Education Association during the year 1940-41 gave major attention to the problem of *Religious Education and Public Education*. This general question was explored on the elementary and secondary school level as well as on the level of higher education. With the cooperation of the Program Committee, a special syllabus for consideration of this topic was prepared by the Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Stewart G. Cole, and Harrison S. Elliott, President of the Association. This syllabus*** was used as the basis of local and regional conferences and meetings conducted by the President of the Association in twenty-nine centers in nineteen states. It had a wide circulation.

The present syllabus has been prepared on the basis of the experience of the past year for the use of local and regional groups during the year ahead. On the vote of the annual meeting of the Religious Education Association in May, 1941, the topic has been broadened to include aspects of the educational experience of children and youth other than their school training, but it was decided to make the focus of attention for another year the problem of religion in the school experience.

There seems to be no question about the timeliness of this topic. In every place he visited, the President of the R.E.A. found evidence of interest and concern about the place of religion in the educa-

tion of children and youth. The widespread emphasis upon weekday religious education and upon school credit for courses in religion are evidence of the attention being given to the problem in local communities in all parts of the nation. Fifteen possible reasons for this interest and concern were listed in the 1940-41 syllabus. The conferences and investigations conducted by the President of the R.E.A. together with examination of various reports and printed documents on the problem would lead to the conclusion that the following are the most important causes of the added attention to the problem on the part of local communities at this time.

1. Religion in the commonly accepted connotation of this term has to a greater or less extent, depending upon the local situation, been eliminated from the public schools because of sectarian differences and in the interests of religious freedom.

2. A large proportion of children and youth are not connected with churches or synagogues and are not receiving any directly organized religious education.

3. The program of religious education, particularly in the Protestant churches, is inadequate in extent, content, and leadership.

4. Home religious training has to a great extent disappeared.

5. The churches and synagogues occupy a less predominating position in the life of the community than in former generations and there is less emphasis upon religion in its organized forms than previously.

These reasons are all aspects of what might be termed the increasing secularization of life in the United States and it is this which has made the problem acute,

*A syllabus on Religion in Higher Education is also available.

**President of the Religious Education Association, Professor of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

***The syllabus was published in RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, October-December issue, 1940.

coming as it does at a time when there is disillusionment and confusion in the whole world situation. There is no implication in this statement that this secularization of life is wholly negative. It represents a mixed picture and there are many positive elements. But it has greatly increased the difficulty of educating children and youth in religion as it is commonly understood and particularly in securing their affiliation with the church. In former generations, those interested in the religious education of children and youth had more community support for their endeavors than at present.

In the colonial period in the United States, religion of the sect of the parents was an integral part of the school experience. With the founding of the new republic and the development of a public school system, public support of sectarian teaching and observance was forbidden by the various state constitutions in the interests of religious liberty. But it was still true that in the more unified community life of another generation, the tenets and practices of religion in its organized forms were assumed in home, school, church, and other aspects of community life and children grew up under circumstances relatively favorable to religion.

With the increasing complexity of community life, this situation has changed. Children are exposed to many and diverse influences, especially since the advent of the radio and the movie. Churches no longer occupy the dominant position in the community they once held. More than perhaps in any other generation since the settlement of this continent, the religious assumptions of the Jewish and Christian religion are being challenged both locally and on a world scale. Many people who in other generations would have been connected with a church are finding motivation and expression through other agencies and in other ways. Religion in its church expressions has been eliminated from the experience of many children and youth. Thus the churches and synagogues and those interested in religion in its historic

expressions face a critical problem in relation to the religious education of children and youth.

References: Preliminary Statements submitted to the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy (This may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, Washington, D.C., for 40 cents.); F. Ernest Johnson, The Social Gospel Re-Examined, Chapt. V; Harrison S. Elliott, Can Religious Education be Christian, Chapt. II; Harrison S. Elliott, "Relationship of Religious Education to Public Education," Jewish Education, September, 1941, pp. 92-98; Elwood P. Cubberly, Public Education in the United States; William W. Sweet, The Story of Religion in America.

I

EXPLORING THE LOCAL SITUATION

It is important that local or regional groups of the R.E.A. shall not carry on their work on the basis of the broad generalizations given in the introduction. No conclusion was more evident from the explorations of the year 1940-41 than the complexity of the religious situation in the United States and the difficulty of making generalizations. Probably no statement made in the introduction but would be challenged in certain communities as not characteristic of their situation. There are still many communities which are overwhelmingly of one religious faith and their situation is very different from those in which two or three of the great faiths—Jewish, Roman Catholic, and Protestant—are found in comparable strength or in which there are still sharply defined differences among the Protestants. Perhaps the one generalization which can be made for the United States as a whole is that a large proportion of children and youth in most communities are not connected with church or synagogue. It is accordingly essential that in making plans to meet the problem, those in each community shall know the facts about the local situation.

A major difficulty in getting a picture of the situation as to the accuracy of which all would agree grows out of two different meanings given to the term religion. Many

and possibly the great majority think of religion as representing the experiences, beliefs, and observances which are found among those in churches or synagogues. There are many different interpretations of religion and varying points of emphasis within the sects and between them. But for all of them, religion has a qualifying adjective—Christian, Jewish, Buddhist, and the like.

Some in the community, and among these are often found leaders in education and social work, think of religion in functional terms as representing attitudes, scales of value, loyalties of individuals and groups. They use the adjective, religious, and think of religious attitudes, scales of value, and loyalties. While they recognize that these are fostered in churches and synagogues, they believe that these religious attitudes and values are also developed in schools, social agencies, homes, and other corporate relationships where there are no church expressions of religion. In appraising the religious situation in the community, they believe it is necessary to include an exploration of the ways in which the values of religion, as thus functionally conceived, are fostered in the experience of children and youth. Accordingly, provision is made in the syllabus for exploring the community situation from both these points of view.

In securing an accurate picture as to the place of religion in the educational experience of children and youth in your community, questions like the following may be used as the basis for getting the facts:

A. The Place and Meaning of Religion as Expressed in the Christian and Jewish Faiths in the Educational Experience of Children and Youth.

1. *What place does organized religion have in the public schools of your community?*

a. In what courses are the religious aspects of history and culture taught? (Check which) History—? Literature—? Social Science—? Music and Art—? Others—? What religious

aspects of history and culture are included in the curriculum? Are religious expressions and beliefs different from those of the faith of the teacher dealt with fairly? Illustrate the facts on which you base your judgment.

b. What type of religious interpretation, if any, is made in classes in Science, History, and the like? What criticisms of any of these interpretations are made by parents and others in the community? What degree of freedom do public school teachers have to make religious interpretations and to deal with religious problems?

c. What religious festivals, such as Thanksgiving and Christmas, are celebrated? Is a religious as well as a patriotic or other secular interpretation given? Give examples of how these festivals are celebrated. What special Jewish, Roman Catholic, or Protestant festivals are celebrated? Are special festivals of minority religious groupings in the community recognized and celebrated? Illustrate.

d. What kinds of religious exercises are conducted in the school? (Check which) Bible reading—? Prayer—? Singing religious songs—? Other—? How are these conducted and by whom? Appraise these religious exercises: Are they formal and of little religious value or do they have real meaning and significance for the pupils? What is the basis for your judgment?

e. Is the Bible studied in the school? If so, in what connection and by whom taught? What is the type of Bible teaching? (Check which) Historical—? Bible as literature—? Ethical—? Religious ideas—? Other—? What is being accomplished by this teaching? What is the basis for your appraisal? What other direct religious teaching is provided? Make an appraisal of its results and effectiveness.

f. What special training in religion and religious education have the teachers who are dealing with religion in the school?

g. What religious problems does the teaching of physical science, social science, history and other subjects raise for pupils?

What conflicts, if any, do they feel between the teaching in these subjects and that which they are taught in home and church?

h. Are the attitudes of public school teachers and administrators favorable or derogatory to the churches and a church type of religion? Do the pupils consider their teachers to be favorable to the church? What is the basis for your judgment?

i. Some consider the public schools Godless institutions and negative in their influence because religion as it is found in the organized churches has been so largely eliminated; others believe that while religion in this more formal and direct sense has been largely eliminated, the schools are fostering the values in life which are emphasized in organized religion, and therefore are a positive influence religiously. What is the situation in the school in your community? Illustrate.

j. What is the attitude of the school board toward religious teaching and observances in the school?

k. To what degree and in what ways does a particular faith or denomination enter into the appointment of teachers? What degree of tension is there between the faiths or the denominations in the appointment of teachers? Why does this exist?

2. *What connection do the children and youth have with church or synagogue?*

a. What percentage of the children in the public school are not in any church school and are not connected in any way with any church? Why are they not connected with a church? Compare the situation in the Jewish, Protestant and Roman Catholic constituency in the community.

b. What percentage of the parents, whose children are in a church school, are not themselves actively connected with the church or synagogue? Why is this the case?

c. Ascertain the following facts about the experience of those of elementary and of high school ages in connection with

Jewish synagogues, and Roman Catholic and Protestant churches.

(1) How many periods per week and how much time on the average is a child of elementary age expected to spend in Sunday or Sabbath school? In other Sunday or Sabbath exercises? In activities in connection with the church or synagogues during the week?

(2) What proportion of time is given to Bible and other study? What proportion to projects, service enterprises, and the like? What proportion to recreational, social, and similar activities?

(3) What provisions are made for worship on the part of children of elementary school age?

(4) What type of curriculum is followed? (Check which) Bible-centered? Life-situation? Projects? What place is given to Church History and religious biography? to ethical and social problems? to questions of belief? Illustrate what is being done in service, recreational, social and other activities.

(5) What provisions are made for children to participate in the life of the church and to feel themselves a part of the church?

(6) In what ways does the church or synagogue seek to be of help and influence in the extra-church life of children and youth?

(7) What results are being accomplished through the experience of children in churches or synagogues? Biblical and religious literacy? Preparation for church membership? Sense of being a part of the church? Realization of personal religious experience? Growth in religious experience? Help on everyday problems? Development of ethical standards? Improved conduct? Other results? On what do you base your answer?

(8) How vital and significant is the experience of children in the churches or synagogues? Is it formal and of little religious value, or does it have real meaning and significance? Why do you think so?

(Note: The same data should be secured for youth of high school age.)

d. What cooperation is there, if any, between public school leaders and those in the churches in the development of an adequate program of religious education for the children and youth in the community?

3. *What is the situation in regard to home religion.*

a. In what proportion of the homes of church or synagogue members is there a conscious and cooperative effort to work out the principles of religion in the home life? How is this accomplished?

b. In what proportion of the homes of church or synagogue members are there definite religious exercises: Blessing at the table—? Family prayers—? Teaching children to pray—? Other—?

c. Is the home and family life an asset or liability in the religious education of children and youth? What is your standard of judgment?

4. *What is the place of religion in the community?*

a. What is the predominating community sentiment in regard to the churches and synagogues? (Check which) Strongly favorable—? Neutral—? Critical—? Antagonistic—? If some churches or synagogues are favorably considered, and others unfavorably, what are the reasons for the differences in community attitude?

b. What percentage of the leaders in business, political, social, and other aspects of community life are actively connected with a church or synagogue.

c. What place do ministers, priests and rabbis occupy in community leadership? What is the basis for your judgment?

d. What is the attitude of the press toward the churches and religion? Do or do not religious news items and religious materials secure their proportionate share in the local papers? On what do you base your judgment?

e. It has been claimed that one major difficulty in the religious education of children and youth is lighter emphasis upon the church and religion as compared with

earlier periods in our history. Is this or is this not true of your community? If so, what is the basis of your judgment? If it is characteristic of your community what are the reasons for this situation? In what ways, if any, is this proving a hindrance in the religious education of children and youth?

f. Some say that even if religion in its organized forms occupies a relatively less important place in community life, actually there is more emphasis upon the values which religious groupings would seek to foster than in previous generations. They give as evidence the multiplication of social agencies, the increased attention to the needs of individuals, the larger social consciousness and sense of responsibility, and the like. As compared with the situation in your community a generation or two ago, is there this increased social consciousness and responsibility? If so, in what ways are these changes a help, in what ways a hindrance, in the church or synagogue religious education of children and youth?

B. The Influence of the General Life of School and Community upon the Religious Development of Children and Youth.

The picture will not be complete unless there is knowledge of the influence upon the religious development of children and youth, exerted by those aspects of their educational experience in which religion in terms of the organized religious groupings is not found. Some think that the secularization of the educational experience of children and youth inevitably has a negative influence upon their spiritual development; others think that an examination of the facts will show that while in what is called secular experience, religion in the more formal and direct connotation of the term has been eliminated, nevertheless in varying degrees there are being fostered those attitudes and values which are emphasized in organized religion, and that this so-called secular educational experience may be an asset rather than a liability

in the religious development of children and youth.

1. Professor Ernest J. Chave of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Religious Education Association, has listed the values which he considers important in the spiritual development of children and youth. He thinks that the religious influence of the school, the church, the home, the social agencies, and other aspects of community life is positive whenever these values are being fostered and realized in the experience of children and youth, whether or not religion in the church sense of the term is being taught and observed; and that the religious influence is negative when growth in these values is being hindered, even if direct religious teaching and observances are found.

The attitudes and values, which Professor Chave believes may be identified in all aspects of educational experience and which he would designate as religious, are as follows:

Social Sensitivity: appreciation of the worth of other persons, conduct governed by respect for human possibilities, identification of self with others in the outreach for the fullness of life.

Sense of Worth: recognition that human life holds possibilities beyond blind animal responses, or mechanized behavior, with desire to realize the fullness of life.

Appreciation of the Universe: discovery that the laws and resources of the universe may further personal and social values when right adjustments are made; significance of man in the total scheme of things.

Discrimination in Values: recognition of a hierarchy of values, and readiness to sacrifice lower to gain higher values; refinement of life, and development of norms and goals.

Responsibility and Accountability: recognition that no one can be a law unto himself; sense of mutuality in all relationships; desire for approval of those who carefully discriminate; appreciation of freedom.

Cooperative Fellowship: appreciation of the fact that cooperation is essential in attaining many values; interest in refinement of group living; enrichment and enlargement of life by cultivation of fellowship of home, church, and organizations working for social ideas.

Quest for Truth and Realization of Ideals: spiritual insight and attainment of desired goals a slow achievement; no magical solutions or supernatural substitutes for human effort; satisfaction gained in the growing insights and accomplishments.

Integration of Experience: universal principles transcend particular reactions; a working philosophy to meet conflicting situations, success, frustrations, tragedies, sufferings; adjustment of individual experiences to racial learnings.

Development of Language and Symbols: to express ideas and ideals; exchange of experiences, ideas, objectives; re-evaluation of values; growth of meanings, clarification of ideas, refinement of purposes.

Celebration of Social Values: observance of special times and ceremonies for keeping sensitive to higher values; conservation and enrichment of worthy traditions; focus of attention kept on significant goals; development of common faith and purpose.

Note: For elaboration of this analysis see *Centennial Fronts for Y.M.C.A. Boys' Work* (National Council of Y. M. C. A.'s, New York City). A further elaboration will appear soon in RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

a. Study the experience of pupils in the schools of your community in the class rooms and in other relationships with teachers, in the school assemblies, in the discipline of the school, in the organization of student government, in the recreational activities and social life. Give specific illustrations of the ways in which these values are being fostered and developed in the experience of pupils, and of the ways in which the realization of these values is being hindered by the school experiences?

b. Make a similar study of the experi-

ence of children and youth in homes, in churches, in Christian or Hebrew Associations, in social agencies, and in other aspects of their community life.

c. Upon the whole, does the experience of children and youth in your community tend to foster or hinder the realization of these values? Why do you think as you do?

d. In proportion as these values are being fostered and developed in the experience of children and youth, are schools, homes, and other aspects of community life a positive, neutral, or negative influence in the spiritual development of the young? What is the basis for your judgment?

2. Some consider that a primary purpose in the education of children and youth is training in a democratic form of life and that in proportion as this purpose is being realized, education is an asset in the religious experience and development of the young. In a democratic form of life, emphasis is placed upon the worth and rights of the individual and upon cooperative relations between individuals. Democracy involves that arrangement of life in which the members of a group, small or large, have opportunity to participate, in proportion to their maturity and ability, in deciding, planning, executing, and evaluating all matters in which the group is concerned, matters both within the life of the group and also in the group's relationship to other groups and to the common life of which the group is a part.

a. Study the experience of pupils in the schools of your community. What provision is there for responsible and cooperative participation on the part of the pupils in the class room and in other aspects of the life of the school? In what ways are children and youth developing skill in a democratic form of life, becoming intelligent about it, and becoming committed to such a way of living? In what ways are the pupils being trained in the opposite of a democratic form of life?

b. Make a similar study of the experi-

ence of children and youth in homes, in churches, in Hebrew or Christian Associations, in social agencies, and in other aspects of their community life.

c. Upon the whole, are children in your community learning the ways of democracy or the opposite? Why do you think so?

d. If children and youth in your community are developing skill in, intelligence about, and loyalty to a democratic form of life in and through their experience in the community, should this be considered a positive influence in personal religious development? Or is this negligible so far as personal religion is concerned? Or does this result in a hindrance to personal religious development? Why do you think so? If they are learning the opposite of a democratic way of life, should this be considered a hindrance to their religious development? Why do you think as you do?

3. Some leaders in the school and in other aspects of the life of the community say the emphasis in the education of children and youth should be placed upon the Good Life. They hold that in proportion as this end is attained, education is a positive spiritual influence, even though there is not emphasis upon the interpretations of the good life and upon the ways of attaining it set forth by the organized religious bodies.

a. What meaning is given to the term, the Good Life? In what ways does this interpretation of the Good Life emphasize the values found in the religion of the churches? In what ways is it at variance with the emphasis of the churches?

b. In what ways are schools, homes, and other aspects of community life giving to children and youth an interpretation of the Good Life and leading them into a realization of such a way of living? In what ways is the influence the opposite?

c. In what ways is such an emphasis proving an asset in the religious experience and development of children and youth? In what ways is this proving a hindrance?

4. Universal education as found in American communities is based upon fundamental assumptions as to the worth and possibility of the individual. Thus it involves a doctrine of man.

a. Just what is meant by the "worth and possibility of the individual"?

b. In what churches or synagogues are the assumptions in regard to the worth of the individual child similar to those in the school? In what churches or synagogues would a different emphasis in regard to personal worth and possibility be found?

c. In what ways is this emphasis upon the worth and possibility of the individual an asset, and in what ways a liability, in the religious development of children and youth?

5. Some leaders in public schools, social agencies, and other aspects of community life find cosmic support for the values which they believe are involved in the educational experience of children and youth; but they do not interpret the metaphysical basis for the values in which they believe in the theistic terms of organized religion. Thus, they have a "naturalistic" doctrine of God and a "naturalistic" form of religion.

a. To what extent and in what aspects of community life is this viewpoint found in your community? What is the meaning of this emphasis?

b. In what churches or synagogues are similar points of emphasis found? In what churches or synagogues is there an emphasis at variance with this? In what ways at variance?

c. In what ways is such a viewpoint proving an asset, and in what ways a liability in the religious experience and development of the children and youth of the community?

C. Summary:

Summarize the situation in your community as to the place of religion in the educational experience of children and youth, indicating particularly those factors which need to be kept in mind in deter-

mining the strategy of religious education. To this end:

1. Review the data secured under (A) and indicate the place the experiences of religion as interpreted by churches and synagogues have in the educational experience in homes, schools, and other aspects of community life. To what degree and for what proportion of children and youth is there provision in the educational experience for religious education in the church meaning of that term? To what degree and for what proportion of children and youth has religious education been eliminated and has their education, from the point of view of the churches, been secularized? How vital and significant is the church-type of religious education of children and youth? Illustrate.

2. Review the data secured under (B) and indicate the religious influence of the general educational experience of children and youth in homes, schools, and other aspects of community life, where there is no direct religious teaching or observance? What attitudes, values, and loyalties of religious significance are being fostered? What attitudes, values, and loyalties of opposite character are being developed? Give illustrations. Make an appraisal of this experience as to its positive, neutral, or negative influence upon the religious experience and development of children and youth.

3. Make a summary and appraisal of the positive and negative spiritual influences in the lives of children and youth and state the major problem (or problems) as to the place of religion in the educational experience of children and youth in your community.

II

DETERMINING WHAT TO DO TO MEET THE SITUATION IN YOUR COMMUNITY

It must be evident from the exploration thus far that there is no single answer to the problem of religion in the educational

experience of children and youth, applicable to all communities. What might be desirable and practicable in a community overwhelmingly of one religious faith would probably be different from that which should be planned in a community of mixed faiths. Communities differ as to the place given to the churches in the community. There are differences in the school situation. There are varying interpretations of religion. All of these need to be taken into account in determining what to do. Each proposal should be examined in relation to the particular community situation as defined as the result of the explorations in connection with (I) preceding.

The question of the place of religion in the educational experience of children and youth has two inter-related aspects which may be considered separately for the sake of clarity in thinking. The failure to do this seems to be the source of some of the confusion in the consideration of the problem. These two aspects are: first, providing for an understanding, appreciation, and appraisal of the place of religion in history, literature, current life, and other aspects of American and world culture; and second, furnishing the conditions for the realization of personal religious experience, belief, and affiliation. The first raises the problem as to what elements and aspects of religion should be included in the general education of children and youth; the second has to do with personal religious orientation and concerns the provisions which should be made to help children and youth come to religious experiences, beliefs, and affiliations of their own.

A. Securing an Understanding, Appreciation, and Appraisal of Religion as an Aspect of Culture.

1. Possible ways of providing for this.

A review of the actual methods being used in various communities in the United States reveals the following possibilities which are now being utilized:

a. An interpretation and appraisal of the distinctive characteristics of life in any period of history, with special attention to the "American way of life" and to the values which have been embodied in the experiment in democracy in this country, without consideration of the positive and negative influences of religion in its organized forms.

b. Consideration of the expressions and manifestations of religion in life and culture in connection with the teaching of history, literature, social science, and other subjects, in the same way that political, economic, artistic and other aspects of culture might be considered.

c. Making religion, including the literature of the Bible, a special subject in the public school curriculum with teachers especially employed for this purpose and paid from public funds as other teachers are paid.

d. Giving official recognition to religion as a part of public school education through "released time," school credits, and the like, but having the religious teaching conducted and supported by the churches and synagogues, either individually or cooperatively. Weekday religious education is the plan usually followed.

e. Education of children and youth in parochial or other private schools under religious auspices in which religion is an integral part of the curriculum.

f. Responsibility taken by churches or synagogues or their allied agencies to bring children and youth an understanding, appreciation, and appraisal of religion as an aspect of culture, but with no official connection with public school education. Under this plan, there is usually special attention to the particular faith or sect. Some advocate "dismissed time" or a reduction of the school week sufficient to give a place for this part of the education of children and youth.

2. Examination of these possibilities.

a. Those who favor "a" say that the function of the school is to bring an understanding and appreciation of the common

life of any period rather than to give special attention to those aspects of the culture which are the special interest of particular groups. They believe that the distinctive responsibility of the public school is to interpret our American way of life and to prepare for citizenship in a democratic form of government. While they recognize that this country was founded by individuals of various religious sects, they say that the values for which they stood have become so integrally a part of our life that they represent the faith of non-church as well as of church people, and can better be understood in their general cultural setting than in connection with the points of emphasis of particular religious groupings.

Will this plan give a fairer interpretation of the life of any period than to give direct attention to the contribution of organized religion? Why or why not?

b. Those who favor "b" believe that only in this way can religion be made an integral part of the general education of children and youth, and can religion actually be incorporated or re-incorporated in their education. They believe it eliminates the unfortunate situation in which children and youth in their public school education are given understanding and appreciation of practically every sound human interest except religion. They think such a plan is in harmony with the principles of the separation of church and state and of religious liberty, since it is "sectarian" and not "religious" teaching which is forbidden along with partisan politics.

Is it possible in your community for the History, Literature, Social Science, and other teachers to deal with the religious aspects of their subjects or is the consideration of the place of religion in culture so controversial that it can only be provided for through church-sponsored or synagogue-sponsored teaching? What is the basis for your judgment? How, if at all, does the question of teacher and school freedom and responsibility to deal with the religious aspects of culture differ

from the same question in connection with other matters on which the conviction of the community is divided? If the religious aspects of culture are eliminated from publicly supported education because they are controversial, should this policy also apply to the consideration of controversial political and social questions? Why or why not?

Is it practically possible for a teacher to deal fairly with the religious aspects of history or of current life, when these involve religious faiths or sects different from those to which he or she belongs? Why or why not? Can public school teachers be trusted to deal with the religious aspects of culture fairly and understandingly, or is religion so much a matter of particular beliefs and approaches that it can be taught properly only by an individual of a particular faith or denomination? Why do you think as you do?

Does teaching the religious aspects of culture as an integral part of the public school curriculum endanger the principles of the separation of church and state and of religious liberty? Why or why not?

c. Those who favor "c" agree with the second viewpoint in their desire to have religion made an integral part of the public school curriculum. They think, however, that this cannot adequately be done except as it is made a special subject, partly because the amount of material to be covered makes it worthy of such recognition and makes such special provision necessary, and partly because adequate teaching of religion requires special training which cannot be demanded of all public school teachers. Just as there is a special art or music teacher, they would have a special teacher of religion.

If teaching the Bible and religion is to be included in the public school curriculum, does this require a specially trained teacher and special provision for it in the curriculum, as is often done in the case of music and art. Why or why not?

Under what conditions, if any, would it be permitted under the constitutional provisions for a special teacher of the Bible

and of religion to be included in the public school and to be publicly supported? What is the basis for your judgment?

d. Those who favor "d" hold this viewpoint for practical reasons. They admit the theoretical possibility or even the desirability of incorporating religion within the public school curriculum; but they say that actually religion will be taught by a Protestant or a Roman Catholic or a Jew, and that whatever the intentions, each will inevitably teach the religious aspects of culture from a particular faith or sectarian viewpoint, if not indeed with a sectarian bias. They say that the Protestants will not be satisfied with the Roman Catholic's interpretation of Protestant aspects of culture, nor will the Roman Catholic be satisfied with the Protestant's, and the same will hold good for the Jews. Inevitably, from their viewpoint, religious liberty and the separation of church and state are endangered. They think that to allow each religious faith or denomination to teach its own children and youth, but with official recognition of this religious teaching by the public school, safeguards the separation of church and state and is the most practicable method under the present conditions in the community. Therefore, they favor either weekday religious education on released time or school credit for religious education in churches and synagogues.

Is it or is it not true that those of a particular religious faith do not want the religious aspects of history and culture to be described and interpreted to their children by teachers of a different religious faith from their own? What is the basis for your opinion?

Does the plan of weekday religious education on released time and of school credit for religious education under church or synagogue auspices give children and youth a fair and adequate understanding and appreciation of the religious aspects of culture, and does it make religion an integral part of the general education of children and youth? Why or why not?

Is such a plan in harmony with the prin-

ciple of the separation of church and state? Why or why not?

e. Those who favor "e" agree with "d" in their belief that the religious aspects of culture are inevitably taught from a certain point of view; but they are not satisfied with having religion as a parallel though recognized subject. They agree with "b" that it should be built integrally into the curriculum, and also with "c" that it demands special attention in the curriculum. The most desirable method, therefore, seems to them to be the establishment of parochial or other private schools under a particular religious grouping where there is complete freedom to make religion an integral part of the curriculum.

Are the advocates of parochial or other private schools correct in their conviction that it is only in a school under religious auspices that religion can be integrally and effectively made a part of the general education of children and youth? Why or why not?

Would the general adoption of such a plan endanger the contribution of the schools to the democratic way of life? Why or why not?

f. Those who favor "f" agree with "e" in the contention that the religious aspects of culture must and should be taught from a particular religious point of view. But they are not willing to provide for this through parochial or other private schools because of their conviction of the importance of the public schools to our democracy. They believe that the function of the public schools is to educate in the democratic way of life; and in proportion as they do this well, they think that they will furnish the background for special education in the religious aspects of culture, which in their judgment should be provided in churches or synagogues. They do not favor official recognition of religious education in the churches, as advocated by "d," partly because the time under such a plan is inadequate and partly because they do not consider it sound public policy for the school to give aid to

education under sectarian auspices.

What are the advantages and disadvantages of attendance at public schools as compared with attendance at parochial or other private schools under religious auspices? Why do you think so?

If pupils in the public schools are educated in a democratic form of life, does this give a favorable background for teaching the religious aspects of culture in churches or synagogues? Why or why not?

Can the religious education of children and youth in connection with churches or synagogues give a fair understanding and appreciation of religion as an aspect of culture, or is it inevitably so much from a faith or sectarian viewpoint that it will give a warped picture of the place of other religious faiths or sects in our culture? Why do you think as you do?

3. *Coming to a conclusion.*

In view of the local situation as revealed by the exploration of local conditions (See I) and on the basis of the examination of the various plans which are being utilized (See II, A, 1 and 2), what should be done in your community about securing an understanding, appreciation, and appraisal of religion as an aspect of culture in and through the educational experience of children and youth?

Coming to a conclusion will probably involve discussion of summary questions, such as the following:

a. Will description and interpretation of the distinctive characteristics of any period, without special consideration of the religious aspects, give a fairer picture of that period than to include direct attention to the contribution of organized religion? Why or why not?

b. Is understanding, appreciation, and appraisal of religion as an aspect of culture important in the general education of children and youth? Why or why not? Does such study involve a recognition that religion changes and develops as it meets new conditions and ideologies? Why or why not?

c. Should the religious aspects of culture be taught as a part of the public school curriculum and on a non-sectarian basis, or is religion so much a matter of particular experiences, beliefs, and practices that the religious aspects of culture can be taught only from the viewpoint of a particular faith or denomination? Why?

d. If the religious aspects of culture are to be taught as a part of public education from a non-sectarian viewpoint, what does this involve as to the training of teachers, as to teacher and school freedom, and as to the attitude of the churches and synagogues?

e. If the religious aspects of culture are to be taught from a faith or denominational point of view, how should this be provided for? Through parochial or other private schools under religious auspices? Or through weekday religious education on released time or school credit for religious education in churches and synagogues? Or through church or synagogue religious education without public school recognition or credit? Why?

f. If provision is made for weekday religious education, should its primary function be to provide for the teaching of the religious aspects of our American culture from a faith or denominational point of view? Why or why not? If weekday religious education is utilized for this purpose, should it be organized on an inter-faith, a faith, or a denominational basis? Why? How should it be oriented with the public school program?

g. Does an appraisal of religion as an aspect of culture involve a critical analysis of the goals and values, emphasized in the various religious faiths and sects, and a judgment as to whether these are given lip service or are actually realized in experience and life? Why or why not? Does it involve consideration of the desirability of the goals and values emphasized by the different religious faiths and sects? Why or why not?

h. In the plans as proposed, what phases of religious experience, if any, seem to be neglected?

REFERENCES

References for II, A: Securing an Understanding, Appreciation and Appraisal of Religion as an Aspect of Culture.

Blakely, Paul L., S.J., "A Little Flock without a Shepherd, or State Education Need not be Irreligious," *America*, October 17, 1936, pp. 33-34; "Religious Illiteracy in the Public Schools," *America*, February 24, 1940, p. 541.

Bower, William C., "Religion on Released Time," *Christian Century*, August 6, 1941.

Coe, George A., "Shall the State Teach Religion?" *School and Society*, February 3, 1940, p. 130; "Can Religion Itself Trust Democracy?" *International Journal of Religious Education*, October, 1941.

Elliott, Harrison S., "Are Weekday Church Schools the Solution?" *International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940, pp. 12 and 40.

Fox, G. George, "An Old Issue in a New Guise," *Christian Century*, August 20, 1941.

Gilbert, Dan W., "State Education Curtails Religious Rights," *America*, July 31, 1937, pp. 393-394.

Israel, Edward I., "Weekday Religious Education in connection with the Public School," *Jewish Education*, September, 1941.

Johnson, F. Ernest, "Has Religious Teaching a Place in Public Education?" *International Journal of Religious Education*, October, 1939, pp. 8-9; "Religion and the Public Schools," *Information Service*, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, December 28, 1940; "Can We Not Trust Democracy," *International Journal of Religious Education*, September, 1941; *The Social Gospel Re-Examined*, Chapter V.

Johnson, Rev. George, "The Catholic Schools in America," *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1940, pp. 500-505.

Josey, Charles C., "Religious Education in a Democracy," *Journal of Religion*, January, 1938, pp. 19-50.

Mann, Louis, L., "Limitations of Public Education—the Jewish View," *Religious Education*, June, 1927, pp. 587-591.

McGucken, William J., S.J., *The Catholic Way in Education*, Chapt. I-VI.

Sutton, Willis A., "Let's Teach Religion in the Public Schools," *International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940, pp. 12 and 40.

Sweet, William W., "Our Educational Dilemma," *International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940.

Symposium, "Religious Instruction on School Time," V. T. Thayer, Geo. A. Coe, W. Dyer Blair, *Frontiers of Democracy*, December 15, 1940.

The Reconstructionist: Editorials on "The Public School and the Religious School," April 16, 1937, pp. 4-5; "Public School Time for Religious Education," February 16, 1940, pp. 4-6; "Bringing Religious Instruction to the Children of the State," November 15, 1940, pp. 4-5.

B. Furnishing the Conditions for the Realization of Personal Religious Experience, Beliefs, and Affiliation.

Giving children and youth an understanding and appreciation of religion as an aspect of culture will make them religiously literate, and it forms a background for personal religious experience; but it does not follow that because a person has learned about religion that he will have found a religious experience and faith of his own. Personal religious experience and faith are sectarian in the best sense of that term. This is true of "naturalistic" as well as of theistic forms of religion. Personal religion involves something distinctive in the life of the individual and should include affiliation with a sect or group in and through which he finds expression for and growth in his own religious experience.

1. Possible ways of providing the conditions for the realization of personal religious experience, for the development of a religious faith, and for affiliation with a religious group. A review both of practices and proposals reveals the following methods of procedure:

a. Giving opportunity for the development of a positive personal philosophy of life in terms of the values which inhere in the various school subjects and in the life of the school and of other aspects of the community.

b. Teaching in the public schools those common and basic elements of religious belief and conviction in regard to God and in regard to relations with one's fellowmen on which those of all religious faiths agree.

c. Use of "released time" from the public school, school credits, and the like for training children and youth in the beliefs of a particular faith or denomination with a view to leading them into a personal religious experience and into membership in the particular church or synagogue.

d. Educating children and youth in parochial or other schools with a definite religious orientation and atmosphere, where there is full opportunity for religious

ous instruction and religious observance of a particular faith.

e. Centering upon the religious education of children and youth in the home and church. This involves not only strengthening the program in a particular church or synagogue, but also recognizing children as junior members and incorporating them vitally into the life and experience of the church. It involves also the education of parents so that homes may be developed in which there is a religious atmosphere and in which there is both religious education and religious atmosphere.

2. *Examination of these possibilities.*

It is evident that these suggestions are not mutually exclusive and the question is what combination of these suggestions best ensures the conditions for the development of personal religious experience, beliefs, and affiliation.

a. Those who favor (a) say that the values of the "Good Life" are not the peculiar possession of any religious faith or of all the organized religious bodies, but are the common concern of both those connected with the churches and those who have no church affiliation. Even though these values may have grown out of or have been greatly influenced by the Hebrew-Christian tradition, they believe that concern for those values and commitment to this way of life are no longer confined to those connected with the churches. Since so large a proportion of the population have no connection with the church, they believe it is only by approaching the problem on a non-sectarian basis and in relation to the values which church and non-church people hold in common that children and youth may find in and through their experience in the school and the community a philosophy of life to which they are personally committed.

What are the main points of emphasis in a philosophy of life which church and non-church people hold in common?

How does the development of a personal philosophy of life on a non-sectarian basis

and in terms of the values church and non-church people hold in common compare in effectiveness and desirability with the development of personal religious experience in terms of the beliefs of some particular religious faith or sect? What is the basis for your judgment?

b. Those who favor (b) say that this country was founded on religious assumptions; that these religious beliefs are recognized in legislative bodies and courts of justice; and that it is the business of the public school to train children in these commonly-held religious beliefs as it does in the assumptions in regard to democracy. They believe that such a type of education is necessary to furnish the basis for the more distinctive elements in personal experience and faith.

What are the religious assumptions on which our country was founded? What proportion of the people in your community give allegiance to these assumptions today? What is the basis for your judgment?

Are there or are there not commonly-held religious beliefs which could be taught in the schools? Why do you think as you do? If there are such commonly-held beliefs, of what value would it be for the realization of a personal religion by children and youth to have these taught in the school?

c. Those who favor (c) doubt if there are these common elements of religious faith on which all agree. To teach those on which the majority agree would seem to them a denial of religious liberty. In any case, they think it would mean at best a lowest common denominator type of religion. They believe that personal religious experience and faith involve a distinctive religious orientation which can only be developed in connection with a religious group, the members of which have this type of religious experience and belief. They do think, however, that the school should cooperate with parents in the religious training of their children to the extent of dismissing them from school for such religious training. Therefore, they

favor weekday religious education on a denominational basis or school credit for religious education in churches or synagogues for the training of children in the faith of their parents.

What responsibility, if any, has the public school for cooperation with parents in providing for the nurture of their children in their particular faith? Why? Can such responsibility be assumed without endangering the principles of the separation of church and state and of religious liberty? Why, or why not? Is the policy of using the machinery of the school for the promotion of a special interest, even as important a one as sectarian religion, sound public policy in education? Why, or why not? Would it open the way for pressure upon the school from other special interests? Why, or why not? If political or other important groupings in the community asked for similar arrangements for the education of children in particular ideologies, should their request be granted? Why, or why not?

Under what conditions does weekday religious education and school credit for religious education conducted by particular faiths or sects provide a plan which safeguards the separation of church and state and religious liberty?

In what ways does official recognition by the school strengthen, and in what ways weaken, the work of churches and synagogues for the nurture of children and youth in a particular faith?

If, on the request of the parents, the public school is to cooperate with the organized religious faiths and sects in their plans for the training of children in a particular faith, what safeguards are necessary in order to be fair to those of no religious affiliation?

If weekday religious education is used as an aid to realization of personal religious experience, beliefs, and affiliation, how should it be organized?

d. Those who favor (d) emphasize the importance of the school in the educational experience of children and youth.

They believe that it is not enough that the young shall have religious influences in home and church. They fear the effects of a secular school. They believe also that it does not meet the problem of religion in the school experience to have some instruction in religion, either within the school or on "released time." They think that it is necessary that the whole orientation and atmosphere of the school shall be religious. Therefore, they favor parochial schools in order that the influence of the school as well as of the home and the church shall be religious.

What relative importance has the school experience of children and youth in the realization of personal religious experience and the development of personal religious convictions? Is it or is it not essential for the personal religious development of children and youth that they shall be educated in a school of definite religious orientation and with a distinctly religious atmosphere? Why?

e. Those who favor (e) are not willing to sacrifice the public schools because of their importance in the life of the democracy. They are not willing to ask the school to grant special privileges for the children of particular sects through "released time" because of the implications this policy might have in relation to demands upon the school from other special interest groups. They would, therefore, center upon strengthening the religious education of children and youth in the church. They believe that it is not enough to train children in religion with the expectation that they will later become members of the church. They think that children should be recognized as members of the church as they are members of the family, and that they should be incorporated more fundamentally and integrally into the life of the church than is the case in most Protestant churches. They also emphasize the importance of the home, particularly in the early childhood experiences. They call attention to the strategic opportunity there is found in helping parents develop a home and fam-

ily life which is religious in atmosphere and standards.

What relative importance has the home and church experience of children and youth in their religious development? What is the basis for your judgment? If the homes and churches take seriously their opportunity and responsibility for the religious nature of children and youth, would or would not this be adequate to ensure the realization of personal religious experience and faith?

Is some adjustment in the school demands upon the time of children necessary to enable churches and homes to meet their responsibility, or do they now have sufficient time available? Why do you think as you do? Is the plan of "dismissed time" with no responsibility taken by the school desirable? Why, or why not?

What justice is there in the contention that in the interests of democracy, it is necessary to maintain public schools and to free them from any responsibility for the fostering of sectarian religion? Why do you think as you do?

What are the most important changes in home and church life which are necessary if they are to realize their possibilities in the religious development of children and youth?

3. *Coming to a conclusion in regard to furnishing the conditions for the realization of personal religious experience, beliefs, and affiliation.*

Review the data out of the discussion of (B, 1 and 2) above, and summarize the conclusions reached. It might include conclusions on questions like the following:

a. What aspects of the experience of children and youth are most influential in the development of a personal life philosophy or of a personal religious experience and faith? What implications does your answer have as to choice between, or as to a combination of, the proposals examined?

b. What is the relative importance in a personal experience and faith of a philosophy of life in terms of the values in-

herent in school and other community experiences, as compared with such a philosophy in terms of some form of historic religion?

c. If in terms of values in school and other community experience, what does this imply for the school and community experience of children and youth?

d. If in terms of some form of historic religion, which alternative (b, c, d, or e) or what combination of these alternatives offers the best hope of furnishing the conditions for the realization of a personal religious experience and faith.

e. How specific should the objectives of such religious education be? Should they be formulated in terms of conduct outcomes, philosophy of life, personality organization and social reconstruction? Why or why not?

f. For the maintenance and nurture of personal religious experience and faith, what is the relative importance of affiliation with some organized religious body as compared with affiliation with an agency with a social purpose and program.

REFERENCES:

References for II, B, Furnishing the Conditions for the Realization of Personal Religious Experience, Beliefs and Affiliation.

Blakely, Paul J., S.J., "A Little Flock without a Shepherd, or State Education Need not be Irreligious," *America*, October 17, 1936, pp. 33-34.

Bower, William C., "Religion on Released Time," *Christian Century*, August 6, 1941; "Making the Resources of Religion Available in Education," *Religious Education*, January-March, 1941.

Coe, George A., "What Sort of Religion?" *International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940, pp. 13-14.

Davis, Mary Dabney, *Weekday Classes in Religious Education*, Bulletin 1941, No. 3, U.S. Office of Education (Supt. of Documents, Washington, D.C., 10c).

Elliott, Harrison S., "Are Weekday Church Schools the Solution?" *International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940; "Relationship of Religious Education to Public Education," *Jewish Education*, September, 1941.

Gorham, Donald R., *The Status of Protestant Weekday Church Schools in the United States*.

Hartshorne, Hugh, "The Real Issues," *International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940, p. 16.

Holmes, Dean Henry W., "God in the Public Schools," *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1940, pp. 99-105.

Hurwich, Louis, "Religious Education and the Release-Time Plan," *Jewish Education*, September, 1941.

International Council of Religious Education, *The Weekday Church School, New Educational Bulletin*, No. 601.

Israel, Edward J., "Weekday Religious Education in Connection with the Public School," *Jewish Education*, September, 1941.

Johnson, F. Ernest, "Religion and the Public Schools," *Information Service*, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, December 28, 1940.

Johnson, Rev. George, "The Catholic Schools of America," *Atlantic Monthly*, April, 1940, pp. 500-505.

Josey, Charles C., "Religious Education in a Democracy," *Journal of Religion*, January, 1938, pp. 19-50.

Kepler, Charles W., "The School Challenges the Church," *School and Society*, September 21, 1940, pp. 215-219.

McGucken, William J., S.J., *The Catholic Way in Education*, Chaps. I-VI.

Preliminary Statements Submitted to the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy (Supt. of Documents, Washington, D.C., 40c).

The Reconstructionist: Editorials on "The Public School and the Religious School," Vol. III, No. 5, April 16, 1937, pp. 4-5; "Public School Time for Religious Education," Vol. VI, No. 1, February 16, 1940, pp. 4-6; "Bringing Religious Instruction to the Children of the State," Vol. VI, No. 14, November 15, 1940, pp. 4-5.

Sutton, Willis A., "Let's Teach Religion in the Public Schools," *International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940, pp. 12 and 40.

Symposium: Religious Instruction on School Time, V. T. Thayer, Geo. A. Coe, W. Dyer Blair, *Frontiers of Democracy*, December 15, 1940.

Wiltby, John, "Public Schools Imperil Religion," *America*, September 26, 1936, pp. 584-585.

Weigle, Luther A., "Public Education and Religion," *Religious Education*, April-June, 1940, pp. 67-75.

III

DEVELOPING A STRATEGY FOR THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH

A. Looking at the problem in terms of the various aspects of the educational experience of children and youth, a strategy should include what can and should be done in and through each of these relationships, such as home, school, church, allied religious agencies such as Christian and Hebrew Associations, social and recreational agencies, and the like. Keeping in mind that an adequate program includes

both understanding and appreciation of religion in the culture and a personal experience and philosophy; reviewing the data out of consideration of these two aspects of the problem (See II) in relation to the conditions and program in your community as revealed by the exploration of the situation (See I), draw up a general plan as to what should be done through these various channels.

B. Weekday religious education on released time is being especially advocated at present as a method of strengthening the religious education of children and youth. Consideration of this has been introduced in the syllabus in connection with both aspects of the problem; but because it is so live a present issue, it should be given special consideration in the development of a strategy of religious education.

Weekday religious education is now being developed in three different ways: First, as a method of securing understanding and appreciation of the place of religion in life and thus oriented with the public school curriculum; as a method of securing the aid of the school in the training of children and youth in the particular faith of their parents, and therefore, oriented with individual churches or synagogues; and third, as a method of showing the concern of all the religious people of the community and therefore developed through inter-faith cooperation and on a community basis.

1. What place should weekday religious education have in the plan?

2. If weekday religious education is included, what is its function and distinctive contribution, and how should it be oriented?

C. There is at present a tendency for each religious or non-religious grouping to consider the problem from its own viewpoint and to come individually to its own policy. How can all those who are party to the problem be led to face the question of the place of religion in the educational experience of children and youth cooperatively and work out a common and sound public policy?

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, BUT NOT IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

G. GEORGE FOX*

THE MORE I delve into this problem of teaching religion in connection with public schools, the more do I feel that the suggested solutions are loaded with possibilities of danger to the welfare of the land.

It is only logical, in times like these, that thoughtful men should insist that all American people, children, youth and adults, should have more opportunity for religious instruction, and that more emphasis should be placed upon the building of religious attitudes. Our complex life, with the freedom that is so often mistaken for license, offers multitudinous temptations, for which ethical and religious training is the strongest possible antidote. Teach this religion in home and church, as the Founding Fathers of our nation suggested, of course—but teach it also in the public schools, is the cry.

The most important argument offered is that the graduates of our public schools are educated in everything but religion. This lack is blamed, by church people at least, upon the public schools. Seldom is it placed squarely where it belongs, upon our educationally ineffective churches and our religiously ineffective homes. Religion lacking, people are becoming terribly secularized. F. Ernest Johnson maintains that “we are steeped in secularism, and this secularization has occurred during the period that has witnessed the greatest effort in the West to build democratic states.” Charles C. Morrison urges that “American society is steadily becoming a secular-minded society,” and that this secularization, *unless stopped by religious education in public schools*, will ultimately destroy American democracy.

To us who are trying to maintain the tradition of the separation of church and state, the words of Horace Mann, the founder of our public school system, re-

veal a far more potent danger. The best part of a century ago he wrote: “It is known that our noble system of free schools for the whole people is strenuously opposed by a few persons in our own State, and by no inconsiderable numbers in some other States of the Union; and that a rival system of ‘parochial’ or ‘sectarian’ schools is now urged upon the public by a numerous, powerful and well-organized body of men. It has pleased these advocates of this rival system . . . to denounce our system as irreligious and anti-Christian. . . .”

The effort to keep our free public schools from the intrusion of sectarian teachings, and to prevent them from becoming sectarian week-day “Sunday schools,” is a perennial task.

I do not find any essential difference between the young people of today and those of my own youth. Often it seems to me that boy for boy and girl for girl, the youth of today is superior to that of thirty or forty years ago. Life today is infinitely more complex, to be sure, and it offers young people—and their elders—more opportunities, for good as well as for evil. It has created many more temptations, and types of delinquency are undoubtedly more numerous. But I find no statistics which indicate that drinking, or sex offenses, or juvenile delinquency in general, has increased more than either the population of the land or its wealth. It is not hard to understand why delinquency might have increased during the last two or three decades. The reason is much larger than the “godless public schools.” Let us not blame youth for falling into the water, after we have pushed them in. The important point is that they have not fallen in any more than their elders.

The people of at least two great world powers, following a dynamic and ruthless leadership, bid fair to lose far more than

*Rabbi, South Shore Temple, Chicago

we have lost. Honor and justice, social love, confidence in man and faith in God, respect for virtue, humanness towards the sick and the weak and the aged, reverence for law and respect for treaty obligations—faith, hope and charity—the civilizing elements of the Old and the New Testament teachers—these are being trampled down by certain military dictatorships with a hope that they will ultimately disappear, a hope that is not beyond the realm of possibility.

The problem for us is a real one. If the youth of Germany, after having had the advantage of the finest system of compulsory religious education that their public schools could offer, can wholly, sincerely and with illimitable enthusiasm follow an anti-religious Hitler and almost deify him; if Italian youth can follow Mussolini with unquestioning loyalty; if Russian youth can be led to yield unquestioning obedience to Stalin—and in all three cases follow their leader with a crusading loyalty; what is there to prevent the youth of our own land from following just as blindly and just as enthusiastically the call of some upstart demagogue?

We are greatly disturbed; many of us actually frightened. There have been religious movements in the world in which masses have been swayed and whole nations converted. But national psychoses in which peoples have turned their backs upon their finest cultural contributions, and have hurtled themselves back into the jungles of barbarism, are not common.

Our problem is this: would more religious education, offered with the best intent and the utmost thoroughness in all of our public schools, do any more than the same religion, ministered voluntarily in our homes and our churches, to lead our youth in the better way?

We love our American liberties. We are free men and we want our children to remain free. We want to preserve the religious heritage of which the Bible is the source and symbol. We believe that our democracy has its roots in the Judeo-

Christian dispensation, and that our democracy is, in the political field, an application of the basic truths of our religion. We believe religion is a preventive of evil, even though religion as taught and ministered in Germany and Russia has apparently failed. Our youth must have more of it, if we want to avoid catastrophe. But it must be imparted where the democratic tradition of the land has designated, namely, in the home and the church.

The church is not exercising its educational function well. Some of us would even agree with the *Christian Century* (May 7, 1941) that "the church has practically ceased to exercise any effective educational function at all. The Sunday school with its half hour a week of religious instruction by volunteer teachers under conditions of slack discipline, is barely more than a gesture toward education. All its efforts to introduce more adequate pedagogical methods have proved unfruitful."

Agreeing with this stricture, however, most of us would hesitate to take the next step (*Christian Century*, May 14, 1941): "The only practical solution, as I see it, is to open up public education to include the teaching of religion. . . . Religion is such a major interest of the American community, and if it is not included as an integral part of the community's educational system, the inevitable effect is to create a negative prejudice against religion in the mind of each new generation issuing from the public schools. Their only recourse, if the situation cannot be remedied on the educational side, is to withdraw their children from the public schools, as the Roman Catholics do, and educate them in schools of their own."

Nor would we agree entirely with Dean Luther Weigle of Yale, that "when the public school ignores religion, it conveys to our children the suggestion that religion is without truth or value." Teachers assure us it is doubtful whether questions of religious value impinge to any extent upon the minds of pupils, except when brought to them through religious instruction or discussion.

Parochial schools have been mentioned. They certainly teach religion to their pupils; they are organized *specifically* to do so. Do parochial schools turn out a better product than public schools? Well, Cook County in Illinois had a total of 4,893 male juvenile delinquents 10 to 16 years old, between 1927 and 1933. Of these, 3,412, or 71 percent, belong to those national groups which live in the areas that have the largest number of parochial schools. These statistics are not conclusive, of course; yet it would seem normal that the churches in these areas of greater poverty and privation would make a stronger attempt in their religious instruction to fortify children against the increased temptations which exist under less favored conditions. The great majority of inmates of prisons come from these areas, and practically all of them profess to have had some religious education.

One of the undisputed blessings of our American way is the tradition of the separation of church and state. It is one of the most potent preservatives of our type of democracy—it has kept us religiously free men. It grew out of the rich experience of our land, to which many nationalities, religions, racial groups and cultures contributed.

The Pilgrims and Dutch Reformed, the Quakers and the early Jews, the Huguenots and Moravians, the Presbyterians and Lutherans, the hosts of Irish and Germans, East and South Europeans, people largely of the Catholic and Jewish faith, came here because they had heard that this was a land of and for the free—and because it offered “an asylum for the persecuted and oppressed.” They wanted freedom of religion, and still want it; they believe in the separation of church and state; in the teaching of religion by the church and home, not by the state.

Those Americans who oppose the reintroduction of religious instruction into public schools fear that it would mean a particular kind of religion—Protestant in some places, Catholic in others, but in any case, Christian.

Some years ago Professor Charles T. Holman published an article in the *Christian Century*, “I Don’t Want to Christianize the World.” From the very influential editor of that paper came a rejoinder, “Do I Want to Christianize the World? Yes.” This gentleman strongly advocates teaching religion in public schools. Is there any doubt *what* religion he would teach?

A strong exponent for teaching religion in public schools said recently, “Christianity is the most important factor in the history of mankind. . . . It has supplied all the elements that distinguish it from the culture of the ancient world. . . . It has created home. . . . Shall our children be forbidden to learn what Christianity is . . . ? We are by profession a Christian people.”

Just one more: “A system of religious doctrine, if it were nothing more,” said J. H. Seelye recently, “would be inapt as a system of moral precepts, to secure the inspiration of virtue so indispensable to a commonwealth. But the life of Jesus Christ has shown itself abundantly able to do this. Why, then, should it not be brought in closest contact with our life, and our children be kept continually under its inspiration . . . ? Why should it not enter into all our processes of education?”

Is there any wonder why those loyal Americans who adhere to religious faiths other than the Christian would dread to see religious faith of any kind taught freely in our public schools? The majority is too strong, and too dogmatic in its insistence that the “true religion” should be taught.

Against the contention that our public schools have turned out godless and evil generations, threats to democracy, let the following testify: Prof. Hugh Hartshorne of Yale (*International Journal of Religious Education*, November, 1940) says: “Indeed it might well be questioned whether the moral phases of religious teaching involving concepts and habits of good behavior, have not been far more thoroughly inculcated through the public

schools than through the Sunday schools. In spite of the shift from religious to secular culture, the country is probably far more conventionally moral in its general conduct than was the case when the churches or exponents of the religious heritage conducted the schools and dominated the common life."

Prof. Edwin E. Aubrey of Chicago, in *Science, Philosophy and Life*, maintains that "the real believer in democracy will be concerned wherever barriers arise to impede the free exchange of experience, whether those barriers are racial, religious, economic or linguistic. In the American form of democracy, this has a special significance because of the great extent to which our population is drawn from immigrant strains representing a variety of cultural backgrounds. The temptation to standardize all of these culture groups within a single pattern would threaten the richness of our collective experience and deprive us of valuable contributions." These words are particularly applicable to those who want to create not only patterns of religious education in the schools, but who would go further and force their pattern of Christianity upon the minority groups attending the schools.

Much has been said about the necessity of "integrating religion in the life of youth." This has been advanced as another reason for the introduction of religious instruction in the schools. In this connection we quote a statement from the *Christian Century* (March 19, 1941) itself: "Just how 'integral' can religion be with any phase of the social order under American conditions? In a society which is characterized by a diversity of faiths and which cherishes religious liberty, it may be said that religion cannot be made an integral part of the organized life of the community—its government, its business or its system of public education. The life of the individual must be a harmonious whole—an integrated life—and those who know and have experienced the meaning of religion cannot see how any life can be satisfactorily organized without having religion per-

meating all its relationships. But to unite a religion integrally with the public institutions of the nation is something quite different. To avoid the dangers implicit in that, our fathers laid down the principle of the separation of Church and State."

With this part of the editorial we are in complete accord. Religion cannot be taught—it must be lived. Many friends among the clergy have told me that the finest results of religious instruction have been achieved not by the teaching of religious experts, but by the example of a beautiful life set by men and women whose character, rather than their knowledge, influenced the children. This has been my experience also.

Religious education in public schools would necessarily introduce an element of confusion or, at best, misunderstanding. Whether we will it or not, religion as a way of life has a label. There is the Christian way of life and faith. There is also a Jewish way of life and faith. The following excerpt, taken from a letter written to the editor of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION by one of the finest of men, a Jesuit priest, shows that there is a Catholic way of life and faith. His letter came in response to an invitation extended to him, to a Protestant, and to a Jew, to collaborate on a statement that might serve as a declaration of ethical and religious values to be used in the public schools.

He says, quite simply: "It would be impossible for me to collaborate in the project you describe in your letter. I am convinced of the existence of Christ as a historical fact, of His divinity, and of the existence of an unchangeable revelation entrusted by Him to His church. I can respect and be tolerant of any man of sincere convictions, but I cannot so act as to create grounds for believing that I agree with one who considers that the really fundamental things in religion are common to all religions. Nor am I interested in a system of public school ethics which is based upon an unsound foundation, as is any system which does not begin by establishing the existence of God

and of obligations arising from our relationship to Him and to our fellow man."

He continues: "The attitude that would be developed (by the other two members of the group) in school children, might appear externally to be the same as mine, but they would be completely different in their foundations. We might respect each other, as I believe we do, but we could never agree on any declaration of principle involving ethical or religious issues."

These sincere and courageous words from an outstanding teacher of Catholicism indicate at least one difficulty in trying to force religious education upon public school pupils, who may be Catholics, Jews (and possibly Jehovah's Witnesses), besides Protestants. Religious education just does not belong in the public schools—as long as we cherish our traditions of freedom, and respect the rights of religious minorities.

How easily we fall into the smugness of the majority may be illustrated by an excerpt from an article which deals with what should be done with dissenters and atheists who do not wish their children to be participants in religious instruction: "No assignment should be required of any child which compels him to some form of religious adherence. But to go farther and to divest the public school completely of religious faith to meet the scruples of the pagan few, is to coerce the conscience of the many for whom religion is an essential part of education."

This statement drew the following merited criticism from Rabbi Albert Minda in his report to the Conference of American Rabbis: "The significant words in this statement are *the pagan few*. The term 'pagan,' as history so tragically reveals, is a relative one and it is to the credit of the American state that it has never officially recognized such a label. To bring about any system in the public school where officially or unofficially any pupils or their parents are placed in the category of the 'pagan few' would represent a threat to our entire democratic system and way of life." And with this, we agree entirely.

The Digest of Bulletin 1941, No. 3, "Weekday Classes in Religious Education," issued by the United States Department of Education, confirms the fallacy that the release-time plan removes the objections that religious education in public schools violates the spirit of the freedom of religion and the separation of church and state. Reports were received from 2211 city and town school systems, of which 282 implemented the release-time plan. Five states, New York, Minnesota, Virginia, Ohio and Utah, sent in 264 reports. Discontinued programs were reported by 94 communities. While the 1940 figures showed an estimated 19% increase in number of schools releasing pupils over 1932, the increase comes largely from the five states noted. A check in 1940 of a third of the school systems in each population group reporting the release plan in 1932, shows that 29 (41%) continue to release pupils; 19 (27%) have discontinued the program; while 23 (32%) gave no reply to the 1940 inquiry. "It would seem," the report goes on to say, "that during the past eight years, more than half of the programs reported in 1932 have either been discontinued or too little interest had been developed to prompt a reply to the inquiry."

The Digest further reports that in current practice, four out of every ten classes in religious education meet in public school buildings. This is in spite of the fact that "objections to the use of school buildings center upon a possible infringement upon constitutional restrictions against the use of public school funds or property for religious or sectarian purposes."

A check-up of two thirds of the programs indicates that both in the elementary and the high school classes "major emphases are about equally divided between Bible study and character education, with church doctrine and good citizenship less frequently mentioned." Further on we read: "Variation in these emphases include outstanding attention to Bible study in high school classes where credit is granted, and upon church doc-

trine in the schools of places which have small populations."

In the appointment of teachers, the report shows that for four out of every 100 programs, the teachers are appointed by public school officials, while 37 out of every 100 teachers are recommended by the sponsoring body, and appointed by public school officials. This means that public school officials connected with the release plan schools, appoint 41 out of every 100 teachers who teach religious education. This appears to me to be a pretty strong tie-up between the schools and religion, and I believe a flagrant violation of American public school tradition.

In a number of schools, according to the report, credits toward graduation are given for religious studies. This is also included in the Chicago plan as approved by Superintendent Johnson. Aside from the fact that giving credit for the study of religion in high schools appears to me to be in the nature of a bribe to students, I find that educators differ very sharply as to the necessity of credits. One of the questions in a questionnaire sent out by the Chicago Schools Committee was: "In your judgment, is the giving of credits necessary to secure attendance at the classes (in religious instruction)?" The answers that came are from the officials of the school systems in the largest cities of the country. They show no agreement. Eight, including San Francisco, were non-committal; eight, including New York, said "No"; five, including Denver, said "Yes." With such a diversity of opinion among educational leaders, why not wait until some definite conclusion is reached by them before rushing into the credit system?

In the plan which the Interfaith Committee of the Church Federation presented to Dr. Johnson, and which he personally accepted, the following sentence occurs: "The list of teachers and their qualifications, together with syllabi of the courses to be offered will be reviewed by the Interfaith Committee and submitted to the Superintendent of Schools." It is not the duty of public officials, we submit,

to select teachers of religion or to pass on syllabi of religious courses, or to judge religious education qualifications of teachers, whether in Chicago or in the other 41 places where it is done. In the first place, it violates the principle of the separation of church and state, to which public officials are committed; in the second place, there might very well be a doubt about the qualifications of the officials themselves to make the selections; and in the third place, the letter from our Catholic friend quoted above shows the difficulties that must arise in communities where non-Protestants are entitled to the legal right of protection from religious majorities who happen to be Protestants. It will be hard to avoid theological difficulties which may introduce suspicion and strife where they now do not exist. The school ground, above all places, ought to be free from this.

In view of the fact that Gary, Indiana, sponsored the first and at one time the most successful release-time plan of religious education, a report from Gary might be interesting. This is dated July 29, 1941, and is based upon statements furnished by some of the higher educational officials of that city. "The church-school program has not been abandoned by the Gary school system. . . . The enthusiasm for religious instruction seems to have died down noticeably since the depression. This is especially true in the Protestant field. The breakdown there was due to financial inability to maintain the plan. But the economic up-turn has not been reflected in any renewed support for religious instruction among the Protestants."

The report continues: "Taking one well-known school, the Horace Mann elementary and high school, the following typical situation exists: The Catholics conduct two Bible classes which are pretty well attended. Under the State law, its members are given academic credit if they pass an examination conducted by a State Board that supervises religious instruction. The Protestants have no classes in

the high school department. In the grade school, however, the reverse is true. There the Protestants have several classes, not particularly well attended, and the Catholics have none. The absence of Catholic classes in the lower range is explained by the fact that most of these children are reached by the parochial schools. The Jewish children attend the afternoon synagog schools, which are maintained according to Jewish educational customs, but cooperate with the plan as much as possible. To summarize: The religious instruction programs under the release-time plan in Gary has declined not because of any change in the attitude of the school authorities towards the program, but because of the withdrawal of financial support on the part of the contributing public."

I have not been able to get a unified statement on the reasons for the apparent inability to re-enlist public support for the plan among Protestants. One wonders whether the early success of the Wirt plan may not have weakened the attitude of the church supporters when they were told that it was the public school and not the church that was responsible for the revival of religious education in their midst.

CONCLUSION

The more I delve into this very serious problem, the more am I convinced that it is loaded with possibilities of danger, and this for three basic reasons.

In the *first* place, at no time in our history was there greater need for national union among our citizens than now. Harmony and goodwill among us is indeed a part of our national defense. There must be no strife among Catholics, Jews and Protestants. Religious differences and theological disputes do bring it on.

Four isolated events will illustrate: a group of children shouted at another at the release hour, "there go those damn atheists." Fist-fights were reported growing out of arguments on religion in an-

other school. Stones were thrown in one community at some children who went to a different place than others. In a fourth place, buttons with question marks were distributed to children, asking them, apparently, where they go for religious instruction, and incidentally leading the youngsters to make propaganda for the release-time plan.

These are not happy auguries. Fears have been expressed that they will increase. Other incidents are disquieting. In one of the smaller cities of New York, some of the local ministers teach denominational Christianity in public schools, and this has not added to the good will of the community.

If the hundreds of towns where religious education programs are being carried out were investigated, we should find that they are practically always supervised by local Protestant clergymen. What chance would a few Jewish, Catholic or non-believing families have, even if they did protest? That is not the spirit of American freedom.

In the *second* place, the answer to those who plead for an "integrated" life that only religionized schools can achieve, comes from Dr. Harrison Elliott in the October-December 1940 issue of *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION*.

"The difficulty with weekday religious education is that it introduces another atomistic element into the already broken experience of children. Weekday religious education is integrally related neither to their life in the school nor to their life in the church . . ." There can be moral instruction and ethical content in history, in civics, and in many other courses, and this without running the risk of learning theological dogmas and interpretations from inadequately informed religious enthusiasts.

If real integration is desired, then, it seems to me, Los Angeles is on the right track. There it is assumed that religious education is only one among several aspects of the student's activities which should be recognized by the schools. The

new Los Angeles plan envisages credits for many out-of-school activities, such as church-work, leadership in junior civic life, cooperation with playground leaders, teachers and coaches, club leadership, getting and holding a job, and similar activities which make up a student's total extra-curricular life. Creative ability, talent and ability to think, will be recognized by credit, and then "the home, as an agency where the most sacred, meaningful, and lastingly important of all teachings can take place, must be recognized." This is real integration!

In the *third* place, those who advocate release-time may not desire to do so, but they are nevertheless using the public school as a social force to coerce parents and children to do things they may neither desire nor care to do. Those of us who have lived in small towns know the effect of social pressure. It can be directed against any minority. It is not fair, and it is un-American. Children are quick to see differences; differences arouse suspicion, and suspicion creates unfriendliness. I have heard children of a prosperous church tease the children of a poorer one; I have seen boys of one church throw stones at those of another. The public school is the most active and effective democratizing agency that we have for our youth. Let us not wreck it. Millions of children learn their first lessons of freedom and democracy and brotherhood in the public schools; let us not encourage them to think and do things that will wean them from the true American way and prevent them from becoming real Americans tomorrow.

Finally, I am opposed to religion in the public schools no matter what system, because I believe that *the church has a teaching duty to fulfill*, and that the home must be the example par excellence of religious living to the child. I am fearful that if the church fails in teaching its young, it will later have to surrender other important functions. Then we will indeed have a secular people. The present

tendency to secularization is not due only to the de-religionizing of the schools. Many causes enter into it—science, invention, love for luxury, material philosophies—but these last the church must correct. A *teaching* church is a *living* church; we must not deprive it of its privilege and duty. Let the American church become the three-fold center that the ancients made the *synagog*—a place for worship, a place for meeting, and a place for teaching, and it will come back into its own.

I want religious education not only for youth, but for adults also. But I want it where it can be gotten freely and sincerely, in the home and in the church. I want it without compulsion, and without danger to the freedoms that democracy has given us. I want youth to be religious minded, even God-intoxicated, so as to ward off the hallucinations of power and psychoses that brutalize. Religious inspiration of this sort, cannot be inculcated in one hour on a weekday, nor in two or three. Religious inspiration must come from the ark of holiness, which is the church; and from its Holy of Holies, which is now the home.

Let us ask the assistance of the schools, but only in a way that will not be detrimental to the sacred principles that we want to protect. School attendance occupies most of the day. Why not dismiss the schools earlier. Give those whose parents desire it an opportunity to supplement their Sunday training in religion with weekday training; let those who desire go to churches or synagogues; let others go where they may—it is not one child's business to know where another goes. Let the schools do their best to make reliable, courageous, loyal, upstanding Americans of their children; let the church train its children to walk in the ways of its God, as it knows and understands God; and let the home be an exemplar of right living and practice. Then our land will live, its ideals will be preserved, and its citizens will be blessed.

EIGHTY HOURS MORE FOR TEACHING RELIGION

EMERSON O. BRADSHAW*

THE churches of Chicago, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, have before them a proposal to cooperate with the Board of Education in providing instruction in religion for high school students.

The Chicago proposal calls for two full hours per week of one hundred and twenty minutes of instruction, equal to three high school class periods of forty minutes each. It will thus be possible for a student to accumulate two units of elective credit in religion out of a total of eight elective units.

The experiment is to be initiated in a single high school where students, with the approval of their parents, will be permitted to go to nearby churches and synagogues for two one-hour class sessions each week, the hours to be mutually satisfactory to the principal of the school and to the Inter-faith Committee.

All class and pupil records are to be kept by the teachers in the same manner as is required of public high school teachers. Teachers of courses in religion must meet the educational qualifications required by the North Central Association. Students will be required to meet the North Central Association standard concerning out-of-class work, which stipulates an amount of time at least equal to that spent in class.

The list of teachers and their qualifications, together with syllabi of courses to be offered, will be reviewed by the Inter-faith Committee and submitted to the Superintendent of Schools. Each of the co-operating faiths (at present Catholic, Jewish and Protestant) in the Interfaith Committee will have full charge of its own curriculum content, employment and supervision of teachers, and the general administration of the weekday program, in

cooperation with the Interfaith Committee and the school authorities.

The above is the substance of a proposal made by the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. William H. Johnson, at a meeting of two hundred ministers held under the auspices of the Chicago Church Federation, December 30, 1940. The proposal was favorably discussed at this meeting and at a number of subsequent interdenominational and denominational meetings of Protestant ministers and churchmen. It has been the dominant theme at the monthly meetings of the Department of Christian Education of the Chicago Church Federation for a period of six months. At each meeting of the Board of Trustees of the Chicago Church Federation within this period reports of progress have been made. At a regular meeting of the Board of Trustees on May 26, 1941, representing some twenty denominations and eleven hundred churches, the following resolution was passed:

"In view of the offer of the Superintendent of Schools to release time and give credit for religious instruction on the high school level in churches and synagogues, BE IT RESOLVED: That the Board of Trustees of the Chicago Church Federation approve the cooperation of its Department of Christian Education with representatives of the other major religious bodies, in undertaking this responsibility on an experimental basis if and when the Superintendent's proposal is approved by the Board of Education of the City of Chicago."

This proposal and the Federation discussions that followed resulted in several front-page newspaper articles and rather widespread publicity in the religious press and in other periodicals. Even before it was publicly announced, there had been conversations with official Catholic repre-

*Secretary of the Department of Christian Education, Chicago Church Federation.

sentatives, and very shortly following its announcement, with Jewish, Catholic and Protestant representatives officially. Then took place a series of interfaith conferences with the Superintendent of Schools and informally with members of the School Board. All of the groups concerned were most anxious to reach a common understanding of all of the implications involved in the plan.

Representatives of the Interfaith Committee discussed the plan on two occasions with a local principal and district superintendent, not to mention an assistant superintendent in general charge of the high school program for the City of Chicago. These several conferences with the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent and a local principal brought the Interfaith Committee to grips with all of the technical problems involved. It also indicated that the making of provision for credit courses in religion is not nearly so complicated as had been thought.

Much of the time at the first two conferences with the Superintendent was taken in the discussion of the pros and cons involved in the matter of high school credit courses in religion. There was full agreement with all of the items of the proposal on the part of the Catholic and Protestant representatives. This agreement obtained from the beginning of the conferences. The Jewish representatives, however, took issue with the proposal, mainly as it had to do with credit. As the discussions went forward month after month, an increasing number of rabbinites came out wholeheartedly for the plan, even including the matter of credit. At one stage in the development, the Chicago Rabbinical Association voted to join with the other faiths for one year of experimentation. A later vote, however, rescinded this action by a small majority. The following resolution was passed by the Chicago Council of the Rabbinical Association of the Hebrew Theological College. This action was taken on April 24, 1941, and includes some 15 synagogues:

"In view of the fact that the representatives of the Catholic and Protestant com-

munities in Chicago have seen fit to accept the offer of Dr. Johnson to integrate religious education for high school students with the credit system of the high schools on an experimental basis, be it the consensus of this body to join with the Catholic and Protestant communities in accepting this offer and cooperate to its fullest extent in implementing such program for religious education.

"Be it further resolved that the concern and leadership in the religious program for high school students shall be placed under the direction of religious bodies and in contradistinction to social service or general educational and service agencies."

This Association is making plans to participate in the work if and when the plan is approved.

The next important feature of the development of the interfaith aspect of the plan had to do with the agreements reached by the Interfaith Committee. The one that follows was signed regretfully by the Jewish representatives because they did not think it wise, at that time, to participate, since the "Jewish Community as a whole" could not join in the plan. The resolution will speak for itself.

"BE IT RESOLVED: That those religious bodies which feel themselves to be in a position to do so, accept Superintendent Johnson's offer to release time and give credit at the High School level for religious instruction, to be given in Church properties and at Church expense and under the teaching and supervisory personnel of the Churches; that such a program proceed on an experimental basis; that the groups which are ready to accept this offer regret that the Jewish community as a whole cannot at this time see its way clear officially to participate in this acceptance, but record their great appreciation of the willingness on the part of the Jewish community that the bodies ready to accept the proposal do so with the whole-hearted good will of the Jewish group; and that the participating groups proceed to draft the terms of the proposal and the steps of procedure in conference with Superintendent Johnson."

To round out further the interfaith aspect of the Chicago Plan it will be necessary to include the following action of the Interfaith Committee of April 28, 1941. The Jewish representation on the Committee did not officially represent their constituencies, but personally favor the proposition:

"Whereas the Superintendent of the Public Schools of Chicago has proposed to permit high school students to be excused from their schools for two hours per week on public school time upon the request of their parents in order to receive religious instruction;

"And whereas he has offered further to give them credit for one half elective unit per year for time so spent away from the school premises in order to avoid penalizing them for taking a religious subject for a secular one in the group of electives;

"And whereas he has made it clear that such instruction shall be given in property provided by the churches and synagogues, and that all expenses incident thereto shall be borne by them;

"And whereas he has further made it clear that the teaching and supervisory personnel will be selected and certified by the various churches and synagogues on a basis equivalent to that required by the North Central Association for high school teachers and supervisors;

"And whereas the major religious bodies of the City of Chicago have directly or through their representatives, indicated either their personal desire to avail themselves of the opportunity offered by Superintendent Johnson's proposal, or with their wholehearted goodwill, their willingness that the bodies ready to accept the proposal do so;

"And whereas members of the three faiths have met as individuals or as representatives of their religious organizations to participate in this proposal and to consider the problems involved in availing themselves of the opportunity;

"Therefore, this document has been drafted as outlining the general terms of

the proposal and the immediate steps of procedure whereby the proposal may be implemented.

"Be it resolved: That to further the religious instruction of the youth of the various religious faiths in the high schools of Chicago, there be created an Interfaith Committee of Reference and Counsel, including representatives of the faiths working together in this movement with the following power and functions and principles of procedure:

"Be it further resolved: That this Interfaith Committee of Reference and Counsel:

"1. Serve as a clearing house functioning for the various religious groups and with the school authorities in matters of common concern, such as schools, hours, meeting places, teaching standards, curriculum, etc.

"2. Seek to further general understanding and harmony among the various faiths and within the general community at large;

"3. Consider the general policy concerning the method and nature of certification of attendance and credits to the Board of Education;

"4. Consult and advise concerning structural organization and lines of responsibility of such local religious education councils as should need to be formed in the various school districts.

"Be it further resolved: That the Interfaith Committee of Reference and Counsel:

"1. Proceed experimentally and slowly during the first year of testing;

"2. Attempt the experiment in an area where all three faiths may be included;

"3. Strive initially (a) for quality of instruction; (b) for the perfection of satisfactory curriculum; and (c) for the procedures of interfaith and church-school cooperation rather than (d) for larger number of students;

"4. Consciously inculcate (a) the principle of religious toleration as an accepted principle of all three faiths and (b) the

appreciation and utilization of differences as resources for fruitful cooperation, and (c) the doctrine of separation of Church and State as an accepted working principle of American society.

"Be it further resolved: That a copy of this Resolution be signed by the members of the Interfaith Committee of Reference and Counsel and submitted to the Superintendent of Schools."

While the above statement pertains to understandings reached by representative and personal delegations of the Catholic, Jewish and Protestant faiths, it is significant to note that the Missouri Synod Lutheran churches, 150 in number, and the Protestant Episcopal Churches, 100 in number, neither of which are officially represented on the Board of Trustees of the Chicago Church Federation, have participated officially in all of the deliberations having to do with the Protestant plans for supervision and administration. The Interfaith Committee, therefore, is composed of representatives of the three faiths, and is the connecting link with the school administration.

By this time it is clear that the paving of the way for high school courses in Chicago is comparatively easy as it concerns Catholic and Protestant churches, and even a large number of Jewish Synagogues. While, as has been shown, there is some opposition to the movement among the synagogues, it has been agreed that synagogues individually and in groups shall be left free to participate with the churches even though there may not be official cooperation of the Jewish community as a whole.

While the Board of Education is studying the proposition in advance of taking action on it, the Interfaith Committee has had the full cooperation of the Superintendent of Schools and of the Board, as well as of other public school officials.

From the time the proposal was first announced, members of a few civic organizations have not ceased to shower the members of the Board of Education and

the members of the Interfaith Committee with letters warning them of the grave consequences involved if the Board adopts the proposal as outlined above and agreed to in its main details jointly by the Interfaith Committee and the Superintendent of Schools.

The objections as they have usually appeared, have been briefly stated by Rabbi Louis L. Mann in his answer to the objections as set forth in the City Club Bulletin, March 24, 1941, under the headline, "Mann Objects to the Objections."

"Pedagogues agree that education is incomplete without religious education; they also point to the fact that less than half of the children of the United States are reached by the Church and the Synagogue and that half of those who are reached receive inadequate and inefficient training. Sociologists have often pointed to the fact that the lack of religious education is a factor in the increase of juvenile delinquency. The Released Time Plan does not call for education for religion in the schools, but in Churches and Synagogues of the Parents' choosing.

"Many have opposed the plan because of their lack of confidence in the present school administration, but rather than come out in the open against it for that reason, have rationalized their opposition. My purpose is to face the issue on its merits and analyze the objections to the plan rather than enumerate its virtues or indulge in personalities.

"1. It is claimed that the Released Time Plan is unconstitutional. If it is, that is for the courts to decide. Most of the cases cited are not pertinent to this particular plan, since they refer to Bible reading in the public schools. The simple fact is that more than 600 communities in the United States have been operating similar plans in 35 states without having their constitutionality called into question. If the plan is unconstitutional, we should not remain indifferent but should demand that these 600 and more communities in

35 states give it up immediately.

"2. The second objection usually made against the plan is that it makes for divisiveness and class consciousness. This theory, though plausible, has been completely repudiated by the experience in more than 600 communities in our country. Instead of making for intolerance, as has been so thoughtlessly claimed, experience has shown that the plan has made for a deeper understanding and wider tolerance, making each religion conscious of the fact that "united we stand, divided we fall" is as true religiously as it is politically, and that one religion is not the enemy of the other but, on the contrary, that religions must unite in principle against their common enemies—graft, corruption, crime, poverty, unemployment, maladjustments, disease, regimentation, misdirected nationalism, nihilism, racism, materialism and militarism.

"3. It is claimed that the Released Time Plan would serve as the opening wedge of the union of Church and State. No American worthy of the name would want to abolish the principle of the separation of Church and State. The Mayflower pact: 'A free soul in a free church in a free land' has never been surpassed. Governor Lehman, when he signed the bill in New York City, definitely stated that it did not infringe upon this fundamental law. He had expert legal counsel in addition to a decision of the Supreme Court of New York State in support of it.

"The Catholics do not want to unite Church and State because it would not be a Catholic country. The Protestants do not want to unite Church and State because it would undermine the inherent genius of Protestantism. Jews do not want to unite Church and State because they have suffered from the union of Church and State more than any people on the face of the earth.

"4. If the Released Time Plan is wrong in principle, why should there not be a mighty protest against continuing it in 600 cities and in eighteen schools in Chicago and in seven suburbs? It was inaug-

urated in Chicago by Superintendent of Schools Bogan, not Johnson.

"5. The fifth objection brought against the plan is that the program of religious education should be organized around the Church, not the school. As a matter of fact the Released Time Plan is organized around the Church or Synagogue of the parents' choosing. We cannot continue to be negativists shouting the principle of the separation of Church and State when it is neither threatened, infringed upon nor applicable to the present situation. While 'credit' for courses might possibly involve a technical constitutional problem, it could be formulated so as to avoid it.

"The Released Time Plan would call for training of teachers capable of teaching religion on an academic basis. The by-product of this plan would be the professionalizing of religious school teaching which now everywhere is at an amateur stage.

"The opponents of the plan lean on fears and theories.

"The proponents of the plan base their convictions upon facts and experience."

Since this article is a running account of the Chicago development and since we are quoting liberally from statements that the discussions have called forth, it will not be amiss at this point to quote some paragraphs from Rabbi Hymen Ezra Cohen appearing in the *Daily Jewish Courier*, April 8, 1941, that dwell specifically upon the need for more time for religion, especially as it applies to Jewish high school youth in Chicago.

"How many boys and girls of high school age, between fourteen and nineteen, are there in Jewish Chicago? Over 16,000. How many of these continue their Hebrew education? One thousand would be a very generous figure. Two thousand surely more than a close guess. Certainly more than 10,000 Jewish high school children do not get any religious training in our Jewish schools, whether these be week day or Sunday or Sabbath Schools. And how long do they go to Hebrew school? Most of them drop out after one year, two years, three years. For the girls, the percentage is much, much less. It is therefore no ex-

aggregation to say that by the time our children enter high school the number that get any Jewish religious instruction at all is a drop in the bucket. Perhaps a very important reason for this is the fact that the high school itself is planned to take up the major part of the child's energy and time during the day. Children are only human. There must be some time after school to play and relax, to eat, to visit, to loaf, to follow through some extracurricular interest.

"The religious and moral education of the adolescent, it is apparent, suffers at the time when he is very impressionable, is growing rapidly, and at a time when he is most in need of religious and spiritual guidance.

"What the proposal of the Superintendent does is to give back two hours every week to the Jewish child, so that he can learn his own Torah in his own temple. These two hours in the course of one, two, three and four years are not significant. Students do not get more time for any minor subject such as music, drawing, or whatever it is, and they really learn their subjects. Two hours a week means eighty hours a year in class, and in addition, the time it takes for preparation and homework.

"The proposal is really a partial recognition of the rights of religion to an American child's time and life, no matter what his religious belief may be. For years the schools have torn the minds of our children away from us and fashioned them as they saw fit—without God, without Torah, without religion. Now there is a partial restoration offered. Do you want them to go to your synagogue to get it? Then speak up! Else others may speak for you, honestly, but mistakenly, and it will be your children who will suffer."

Six months of controversy over the weekday problem in a great city has resulted in an unusual amount of individual and group thinking. It, therefore, seems most appropriate to add still another statement. It is a brief of an address given by

Prof. W. C. Bower at Mandel Hall, the University of Chicago:

"I favor Superintendent Johnson's proposal first, on the ground that it is a contribution, though not a complete solution, to the difficult and urgent problem in American education regarding religion as a part of the total education of the child. The earlier solution, which was reached through the exclusion of religion from public education, was not a real solution but only palliative. It has left us with the problem more complex and difficult of solution than the original problem was. For practical purposes the exclusion of religion from public education has resulted in a distortion of the child's culture. It has also created emotional tensions from participating in a religious organization which through silence has received no adequate recognition on the part of the community's principal educational agency. It has also rendered largely ineffective the resources of religion for dealing with the problems of living, although religion as testified by Dr. Jung is in every one of his cases over thirty-five years of age, involved in the solution of personal problems. As matters now stand, more than half of the children and young people five to seventeen years of age in the United States are receiving no systematic religious instruction.

"The reaction of both the schools and churches to this situation have taken four forms. One is the parochial system of education in which the church undertakes to provide all the education of the child under church control. This does not seem to many of us to be a democratic solution. A second reaction has been on the part of the greater number of Protestant churches to provide inadequate religious education through Sunday schools. A third reaction has been to give religious education in church property and under church supervision on time released from the public school schedule, with or without credit. A fourth reaction has been on the part of the public schools in which, in an increasing number of instances, religion is being

taught as an integral part of public education on the same basis as literature, history, and general science.

"A good deal of the significance of this experiment as a partial solution to the larger educational problem lies in the fact that it is based upon a deep conviction that there should be a separation of church and state. In the experiences so far encountered no problems have arisen in reference to the violation of the principle of the separation of church and state. This experience is also significant in that the actual result has been, not to increase an emphasis upon sectarianism, but to lead to understanding and cooperation among the members of the different religious bodies. It has proved itself on the field of experience to have been a unitive influence.

"I favor this proposal, also, because it is in the direction of a significant development of educational theory—namely, that the education of the child is affected by all his experiences in his interaction with his total culture. This means that education cannot be confined to any single institution, even the school. Once this principle is recognized it calls for the cooperation of all the social agencies in a given community that are in one way or another concerned with child development. The cooperation especially affects the family, the school, and the church. All of these institutions need to sit down before the needs of their children and young people and ask what contribution they can mutually make to the total education of the child.

From this point of view the churches have a right to expect from the school objective and whole-hearted recognition of religion where it is normally encountered in courses such as history, literature, and the social sciences. It has the right also to expect that the school will help the child to discover and use the moral and spiritual values involved in his school experiences. It has a right to expect the school to share educational opportunity by releasing a reasonable amount of time in the child's educational schedule. It has the right to expect recognition on the part of the

school for the educational value of his religious education, since the school is in the mind of the public the institution that gives recognition to educational values.

"In its turn, the school has a right to expect of the churches the clarification and explication of religious values—since this is the function of a specialized religious institution. The schools also have a right to expect of the churches that they will cooperate with each other on a functional rather than a theological basis in the interests of the community and of the community's children. The schools have a right to expect of the churches that they, as no other institution can do, will induct the young into the great traditions of religion with their beliefs, practices, and institutional arrangements. The schools have a right to expect of the churches that they will bring their educational work up to a level of competence comparable with that offered by the public school.

"Both schools and churches have a right to expect of the communities that sustain them a sympathetic understanding of what they are together attempting to accomplish for their children. They have a right to expect that the community will develop a supporting public sentiment which is as necessary to cooperative efforts in the realm of social institutions as it is in the realm of taxation. After all, the schools as well as the churches are community institutions and exist to serve the needs of the community.

"If in the presence of this complex and urgent problem the churches should prove themselves to be incapable of meeting the demands of the present social situation, or if they are hindered from doing so by pressure groups in the community, it is my judgment that ultimately religious education will be taken over by the state and incorporated as an integral part in its program of public education."

This six months siege in which "pressure groups," as Dr. Bower calls the few civic organizations that have championed the opposition against the plan favored by

the churches and the school administration, gives one food for serious thought. None of us believes that eighty hours more for a higher grade of religious instruction for high school students solves the problem. It would not solve it if one should add another eighty hours to include the time required for out of class work each year. The dire need for such work, as indicated by Dr. Cohen, speaking for Jewish youth, is admittedly very great in the case of both Catholic and Protestant youth.

Over against this need much could be said of the inertia of the members of the churches and synagogues. The rank and file of these members have said nothing either for or against the proposal. But the "pressure groups" have not ceased to be active. Loose thinking has been abundant, as Dr. Mann has pointed out. Flimsy arguments have been broadcast as in a political campaign. Nothing has reminded one so much of an American election. However, this is not an election. The proposal is not a political football. Neither should organizations nor individuals use it as a means for getting their names in the papers.

For those of us who have been seriously thinking this thing through in terms of the needs of youth, a plan of action, a scheme of interfaith cooperation, a method relating religion to education, it is a far deeper issue than a mere casual recital of the church-state issue, sectarianism, extra public expense, or the bugaboo of religion taking over the schools.

Even "pressure groups" and "administration haters," not to mention those who rise up here and there who may be termed "haters of religion," whether personal or institutional, and those mighty champions of civil liberties who are scared to see anything significant done in the name of religion lest some tiny group or single individual way down the line somewhere may be a bit discommoded—all of these are little less than fantastic pictures of what *may* happen, in every instance lacking cases to prove the points raised.

Perhaps too much time has been given to these so-called issues rather than to the issues of youth's needs, of the place of religion in education, of local community recognition of whatever common ground there may be on which church and school may cooperate to advantage. Some of us have been trying to plumb the depths of these problems while the letters of disapproval have been filling our files and bombs filled with negative resolutions have been filling the air. But criticism from whatever source or motive must always be welcomed. Any good movement thrives on it. It causes the sponsors to plan their strategy more carefully, and to make advances more cautiously. This should be the case without opposition, but it all works together to insure a better outcome.

In one of the debates where a pastor of a Missouri Synod church listened to the pros and cons for a solid hour, he asked the opposition "To whom, then, do the public schools belong?" We want the federal and state governments to have just as little to do with them as possible. We want to keep them free from local politics and the city hall. Who is responsible? By what educational standards and student needs are the schools guided? What harm could come from relating the school to the home a little more closely, and to the church and synagogue, if need be. Why become so jittery at the mere mention of a bit of cooperation between the public schools and the churches and synagogues?

Some have raised the fundamental question whether the school as such is the state. The state must be satisfied that each child has a certain amount of educational opportunity. But the state as such makes little provision as to the exact courses. It has become a sort of custom to offer certain subjects for study—subjects that are supposed to be of practical value or that fit students for further study. There has been no decree anywhere along the line that courses in religion should not be given, nor that credit could not be given for such courses if offered by churches on released time.

The fact is, as everyone knows, that much curriculum building is haphazard, and to a considerable extent guess work. Much of it comes out of the peculiar hobbies and interests of superintendents, principals and teachers. It often comes by way of community sentiment, the suggestions of publishers, or so-called industrial and business needs. Many courses have been included in the public school curriculum to try to answer what appeared to be an industrial, a business, a community, or a national need, to make the schools seem more practical.

It is difficult to pin the school down to state, community, home, church or child. It is not any one of these. It is the community in action educationally. It is a

very versatile thing. It tries many experiments, even including the teaching of religion in the schools on released time.

To say the least, the grass roots of the public school are imbedded deeply in the soil of the local community. In that soil are also imbedded the grass roots of religion. The church and the school obtain their nourishment from the same local community soil. It is in this same soil that democracy itself is rooted. How can religion and education be kept apart? Their roots intertwine. Their fruits can scarcely be distinguished. If education is essential to democracy, so is religion. If education deals with the whole child in terms of the whole of life, then it cannot for long fail to include religion in its curriculum.

WHAT WE DO IN CONFERENCES*

LEWIS A. DEXTER**

MILLIONS of hours—and dollars—have been spent by religious educators in arranging for lectures and conferences and round tables and discussions, usually with the hope that the participants will alter attitude or opinions.

Some speakers sometimes influence some hearers to change some opinions. Some conferences exert some influence on some of those who attend them somehow. So much we know. But more ought to be known.

Which speakers influence which hearers, how, and why? What kind of appeal is most effective with whom? How much

greater, if at all, is the cumulative effect of several addresses on the same topic as of one address? How far and when are particular applications deduced from general statements, even when hearers are convinced of the correctness of the latter? Does a conference-created opinion last only as long as the conference atmosphere persists, and, if not, when not? And so forth.

Experiments are being undertaken which will help in answering such questions—and hence aid those who plan religious education programs to make them more effective. One group of experimenters is composed of social psychologists,¹

*The data included in this research paper were first presented in technical statistical form. At the suggestion of the editor this simpler interpretative style was adopted.

**Special Analyst, Federal Communications Commission.

1. G. Murphy, L. Murphy, and T. M. Newcomb, *Experimental Social Psychology*, 2nd edition, Chapter XIII, 1937, still provides the best summary.

another of market research technicians.²

The development of the latter is of especial interest to workers in the field of religious education. At first they emphasized measurement of the effect of advertising and sales promotion campaigns. Men in business wanted to know how best to distribute their dollars for publicity.

After a period it occurred to some that the most important point of all was, What does the customer want? And still more, What does the *potential* customer want? Although for the most part on purely material and in a sense perhaps trivial issues, customer research has made a real contribution to social adjustment. It avoids a considerable degree of industrial and social waste when a manufacturer is able to find out *in advance* that a certain projected type of container for his product will *not* sell and that another will—and therefore starts turning out the latter, without the costly process of trial-and-error he would otherwise have to follow. It provides a basis for a reasoned campaign of education, instead of a vituperative attack on "ignorant demagogues," when an industry discovers that patrons believe its profit per unit is very much larger than it actually is, and therefore are likely to favor proposals for social control which they might otherwise oppose.

New developments are to be expected here shortly. Customer research may become the basis for a widespread program of morale research. Techniques which helped the toothpaste manufacturer can, with skillful modification, be employed to aid battlers against anti-Semitism. Methods which helped detect weaknesses in a sales promotion campaign may also strengthen an adult education effort.

Fundamentally, the same sets of prob-

lems are faced in market research as in religious education. Only, while all religious educators have had to rely to date upon hunch or intuition, a few business leaders have been able to take advantage of more reliable and valid forms of knowledge.

To be sure, the problems in religious education are in some respects more complex than those in business. But this is more than outweighed by the happy possibility which the relative absence of competition in religion makes possible; that is, collaboration between all those who are working on problems of technique and method, a collaboration which is generally not possible in the business world.

The scientific approach usually involves the breaking-down of one interrelated series of parts into isolated (for the purposes of the experiment) questions and the focusing of attention on them. The person who is not accustomed to thinking scientifically tends to find this procedure unnatural, and to protest because a number of questions are left unanswered by any given experiment. However, this method of attack ultimately makes possible a synthesis of answers in a way otherwise impossible.

There is a widespread belief that although controlled experiments are possible in the natural sciences, this is not the case when one attempts to study human behavior. As a matter of fact, provided there is a careful statement of the uncontrolled variables which might make a difference, any lecture or sermon in a sense provides a controlled experiment from which some conclusions may be drawn. Those who heard it were subjected to certain influences which differed from any experienced by those who did not hear it.³ If analysis shows a "signifi-

2. Unfortunately, most market research organizations are, or consider themselves, bound by obligations to their clients which inhibit them from adequate publication and comparison. The Public Affairs Information Service carries a fairly full check-list of articles in the field. A useful survey is that of Lyndon O. Brown, *Market Research and Analysis*, 1937.

3. The basic points are here given. In many cases, qualifications are necessary if one wishes to attain a hundred percent accuracy. Just as in tennis detailed description of the "frills" which make the *great* player will only discourage the person who need only know the fundamental strokes for eighty percent success, so methodological precision would oftentimes

cant difference" in certain opinions between those who heard it, *before* the speech and *after*, one is justified in thinking it likely that the speech made a difference. If one is able to bring together a group of persons otherwise similar to the people who heard the speech but who did not hear it, and is able to show that they have not changed nearly as much in opinion as those who heard the speech, then one has, other things being equal, "proved" the effectiveness of the speech.

This is a controlled experiment, as valid as anything any physiologist does. Of course, the matter is not as simple as it may sound here. It is necessary that the experimenter shall know something about elementary psychological statistics, if he is to know how to calculate "significant differences."⁴ But the best way to learn psychological statistics is to undertake tasks in which one needs them as a tool. It is necessary to know something about preparing attitude-tests, so as to avoid misleading, or double-barreled statements. It is necessary to use a reasonable degree of common-sense in selecting "control-groups" where one has occasion to use them. And it is necessary to use the most exact precision in stating what one looked out for and observed, so others can check one's experiment. However, these matters are no more complex than those which must be attended to by anyone who schedules and plans a large conference, and most of them can readily be learned through experience and study.

The writer has undertaken two studies which may in a modest way illustrate what is needed.⁵ In 1938 and 1939 attempts were made to *measure* change of opinion at the annual fortnightly conferences of the National Young People's Religious Union (Unitarian). These are held on an island where the number of outside stimuli are less than at many conferences; not be worth the effort for non-specialists who none-the-less employ the techniques we are describing with success.

4. Most texts in sociological or psychological statistics either deal with these matters or give references to works which deal with them.

the persons who responded were mostly around 18 with a scattering down to 14 and up to 30.

Tests were prepared on the basis of consultation with speakers before the conference began. Statements on matters about which the speakers would talk were made up and given to such persons as were willing to check their opinions, before and after hearing the speakers. There were two main speakers, both speaking five times each week; and one midweek speaker who spoke once. No mention so far as known was made of the tests directly in any speech, although they were initially presented as being given to help guide the speakers and conference chairmen. Questions were freely permitted, but the speakers cooperated in evading the two references made to the tests. Statements were (it was hoped) prepared in such a way that their direct relevance to what the speakers said would not be clear. Anonymity was completely preserved in 1938. In 1939 those who wished were permitted to fill in their names, but matching was made possible by an elaborate system of recording residences, parent's occupations, etc., both years. Eighty-one matched tests were obtained the first week of 1938, forty-four the second, and fifty-two the first week of 1939.⁶ There were twenty propositions upon each test, some of which were "neutral control" ques-

5. The 1938 experiment is reported at greater length in *Sociometry*, 2; 76-83 (1939). An attempt made in 1937 was technically at fault; the only result of interest was a tendency to show marked shifts toward "True," whether the speakers' emphasis had been towards "true" or towards "false," a tendency not repeated in the later years. It is possible that a difference in personality between the writer, who gave instructions at the beginning of the week, and a Harvard graduate student who gave them at the end of the week, may have led respondents to feel more like saying "Yes," at the end of the week than the beginning. Preferably tests should be ministered by persons without noticeable mannerisms, otherwise unknown to the respondents.

6. The writer wishes to acknowledge his obligation to all who assisted in the three experiments, and especially to Mrs. Merritt Cutten, Rev. W. H. Gysan, jr., and sons.

tions, about which the speakers were not expected to talk, and on which it was thought there would be no other stimulation to change opinion.

It was possible to check CT, PT, U, PF, or CF (Certainly True, Probably (or Partly) True, Uncertain, Probably False, or Certainly False) on any statement. Respondents were also permitted to check to one side if they found a question unclear or did not understand it. No method was found which permitted facile calculation on the statements which had been checked as not understood. However, very few checked "don't know."

It would be interesting and valuable to experiment with the same statements on different groups, and see how many more would be willing to call a statement "unclear" than would be willing to say they "do not understand" it; and at what point, or on what kind of statement, any significant number of persons are willing to say they "do not know" something. Were the writer himself running a conference he would be more concerned with the inculcation of humility than with the transmission of any specific opinion; but none of the speakers involved in these experiments seem to have had such a purpose in view.

A technique devised by Likert⁷ was used to measure change in opinion on those who checked on the five-point-continuum, CT, PT, U, PF, CF. Obviously, a person who checks CT cannot shift at all in the T direction but can shift 4 steps in the F direction; and vice versa. If the speaker happens to emphasize the points which his hearers already believe, their attitude-test-check will either reveal no influence, or lead to underestimating it. Therefore a fraction is computed by putting the total number of actual shifts in a given direction over the total number of possible shifts, which is subtracted from another fraction which is constructed by placing the actual number of shifts

in the direction over the total number of shifts which might have occurred if shifts had taken place entirely at random. A result of .00 would indicate complete chance, that the speakers exerted no influence positive or negative.

There are two technical questions involved, which however take little mathematics (anyone can, with a couple of hours study, some algebra, and reasonable ingenuity, understand and apply the necessary formulae). One may calculate each shift as 1, or one may calculate a shift of 1 as 1, 2 as 2, 3 as 3, 4 as 4. The writer pursued the latter policy. Or there are other more complex possibilities. And one may calculate randomness on two bases; either one may assume that 50% of the shifts would be in one direction or 50% in the other, or one may assume that the tendency, were there no speakers, would be for conferees to shift towards the position holding the majority view. In 1938 the writer had not thought of the latter possibility until after he destroyed the data-sheets; but the 1939 experiment indicated that for that group, there was no marked tendency to shift towards the opinion held by the majority.

Six speakers were involved in the three experiments.⁸ Marked differences in the favorable direction shift as a result of their speeches are noted. The average remainder for A. was .11; for B. .45; for C. .26; for D. .19; for F. .37, and for E. .31. On the "neutral" questions for the two weeks of 1938 there was a shift of .06 towards False, in 1939 .02 towards True. (The neutral questions are our substitute for a control group.)

It is worth noting that A was at the time Socialist candidate for Governor of Massachusetts and a Negro, and more than any of the others save possibly F a practising propagandist, but/and also

8. To save space, overlapping of the groups is not discussed, but there are reasons to believe this made little difference in the results. However, tests should be given so as to provoke a minimum of discussion, reflection, etc., unless this is specifically desired.

7. G. Murphy and R. Likert, *Public Opinion and the Individual*, 1938, 159-60.

more than any of the others save possibly E, was extremely popular with the group. Attempts to obtain estimates of how well speakers were liked personally failed because all of them were checked as "swell fellows," so this remark is based upon observation. It is also worth noting that the writer's guess, which was confirmed by several habitual attendants at the Conference, and by the man's generally poor reputation as a preacher, would have been that B would be far less effective than any of the others, except that D talked about a less interesting subject-matter; and that B has had difficulties in finding placement, and certainly indulges in more speaking mannerisms which are conventionally criticized than any of the others.

Since A's opinions violated group orthodoxy more definitely than those of the others, a new device was invented to note how effective he might have been. The ratio of the total number changed to the total number unchanged was constructed for each question. The average on the 1938 neutrals was 2.13; 1939 2.18; A 1.13; F 1.17; C 1.35; E 1.39; B 1.49; D 1.60. A and F were the most professedly radical speakers and the most accustomed to thinking of themselves as propagandists; D's material was the intrinsically (to Unitarians) less vital subject of Old Testament prophecy.*

In 1939, respondents were asked to indicate whether they knew if they had changed their opinions and why. In 1938, they had not been told it was a change-of-opinion test, and the instructions would have implied, except to the careful analyst, that it was something else. This may in itself explain the greater number of significant changes in 1939, e. g., that

those who filled out the tests knew what was being sought for. This would not be attributable so much to any effort to please anyone, as to a reflective set around the question, "Now, have I really changed my mind?"

An extremely notable difference between F (academician and propagandist) and E (minister, familiar with group customs, who relied heavily upon humor in the group tradition) is present. Eighty-seven shifts towards E's viewpoint occurred; he is held responsible twenty-six times. One hundred and five shifts towards F's occurred; he is held responsible fifty-four times. And when we eliminate shifts of one degree only, E is held responsible for only eight of the forty-two changes to his emphasis, whereas F is accredited with twenty-nine of the fifty-one towards his emphasis. In many cases, hearers knew what they thought was a result of what E said, probably, but they were not sure whether it was what he thought or not.

Various incidental results were of considerable interest:

In 1939 (the matter was not investigated in 1938) the most marked shifts towards the speakers viewpoint was from those who were "uncertain" to begin with. In 1938 the statement that "Love at first sight is the most perfect kind of love" was introduced as being a neutral. It was anything but neutral. Nor was the statement "The less people think about sex and things connected with it, the less likely they are to get themselves into trouble, and they hear enough about it in all sorts of ways, so churches and schools ought not to have any sex education." The shift on the first was -.19 towards "False," on the second -.47 towards False. In 1939 the shift on the same statement about Love showed only -.05, showing perhaps a steadier, less romantic group. But the writer had been much in error, forgetting that bull-sessions about sex are a marked informal feature of such conferences, and that there is a great deal of falling in and out of love at them.

9. Those who undertake similar experiments might profitably make use of the technical tool, the standard deviation of expected frequency. This showed results very different from those gained by other methods of analysis. It indicated that changes due to F, E, and C, were beyond doubt due to their influence, changes due to A and D probably were, and to B may have been. But the use was not careful enough to make these results worth reporting.

The second week of 1939, there was an attempt to learn something from essay-type questions about the effect of speakers H and I. Sidelights which the earlier tests did not reveal on E and F were obtained. One comment was that E had been responsible for a complete change in personal, social, and religious orientation from easy-goingness to ambition. At present, however, the methods of classifying essay-type answers are not developed enough to permit a person without special training to use them; although as a result of work now being carried on by the Federal Communications Commission, this situation may soon change.

It will be observed that these two experiments did not lead in themselves to any startling information, but that they did indicate some possibilities as to the relative effectiveness of different speakers. There was one major error in their construction: they were designed merely to measure how much influence the speakers had, instead of to test specific hypotheses. The ideal study is one (summarized in Murphy, Murphy, and Newcomb) by Knower of the persuasive power of different modes of delivery and presentation.

Such studies can readily be undertaken by those who organize religious education conferences. If properly handled, many respondents can be persuaded to look on them as rather fun. There is, to be sure, a certain amount of time-con-

suming calculation involved, but this can be radically cut down by the use of statistical machines, where these are available; and where the conference heads are interested, scholarships to the conference may be awarded on condition that recipients afterwards aid in calculation. It is ordinarily preferable to consult a social psychologist interested in the field in the construction of any test. The more ambitious the study, the more technical help is necessary, of course; and there are at least two market research organizations which are prepared to undertake either counseling or administration of studies of this sort.

It is to be hoped that churchmen will appreciate the tremendous opportunity which these techniques open to them. Hundreds of thousands of hours must have been spent during the 1920's by church groups in order to prepare their constituencies to participate in the formation of a peaceful world; a score or so of denominations have maintained at one time or another social action staffs;¹⁰ and yet the result of all this effort is unknown. Work is already starting in trying to prepare church people, especially the younger among them, for the reconstruction which must follow the present crisis. The use of techniques of the sort here illustrated may make such work effective.

10. See L. A. Dexter, "The Administration of the Social Gospel," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 2:294-9 (1938).

The Religious Education Association

PURPOSE: To inspire the educational forces of our country with the religious ideal; to inspire the religious forces of our country with the educational ideal; and to keep before the public mind the ideal of religious education, and the sense of its need and value.

THE ASSOCIATION invites into its membership forward looking men and women who are interested in the efforts of progressive church and school leaders to reinterpret our ancient faith to modern youth in modern terms.

59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago

THE ADMINISTRATION OF RELIGION IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

A Theory of Religious Integration

L. L. LEFTWICH*

AFTER three hundred years' experience with the liberal arts college in America against a much longer background of European experience, there is still great controversy as to its aims, curriculum and place in the social order. The graduates, the teachers, and the administrators of the college are perhaps its most severe critics.

The last two decades have brought forth great volumes of general and specific criticisms. Recently, Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago, charged institutions of higher learning with "love of money," "vocationalism" and "confusion," and "chaos." The prescription he offers is "*Metaphysics*" which, he believes, will give meaning and integration to modern life.¹

Many other integrative bases have been suggested such as "Theology," "Democracy," "Vocations" and so forth. Strange indeed has been the neglect in all these proposals of Religion. This study attempts to relate the theory of functional religion as a process of valuation experience to the liberal arts college as a practical basis of integration.

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

The liberal arts college should educate not only for the development of the student as a growing person but also for the general improvement of human living and for the gradual social reconstruction of culture. And in the college, religion must have freedom of experimentation in discovering the highest human values and an educational pattern rather than

appear as an extraneous, ecclesiastical, authoritarian, and traditional revelation. The goal is creative living in the redirection of the cultural process rather than a passive adjustment to the cultural heritage of the past.² Thus, college education is conceived as the search for, integration of and commitment to the highest human values, for creative living in the modern world.

Since colleges differ so greatly from one another, no ready-made program can be proposed which will fit such diverse campus situations. Consequently, the theory of the religious integration with *general criteria and administrative implications* has been described as a process of democratic education in the college. No universal system to meet all situations appears to be practicable. Likewise, it is assumed that administrators and faculty members must experiment with the theory before thorough evaluations can be secured.

In the revaluation of religion a new basis for integration may be discovered and formulated as a *hypothesis* for college experimentation. College administrators and faculty members should clarify their method of discovering values and initiate experiments in seeking personal and cultural integrations about such values. Some direction toward the quest for a college of integrity wherein religion guides the cooperative search for high values in contemporary culture through methods that are democratic, scientific and educational is timely.

*Graduate Student, The University of Chicago.

1. See Robert M. Hutchins, *No Friendly Voice* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936), and *The Higher Learning in America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936).

2. Clear statements of functional religion are found in William C. Bower, *Character Through Creative Experience* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930), and *Religion And the Good Life* (New York: Abingdon Press, 1933).

CULTURAL TRENDS, 1636-1941

The American liberal arts college is a hybrid institution; it is not American, English, Scotch, or Continental—it is a combination of many streams of culture. Neither is the college a pure deposit of theological, democratic, scientific, technological, or geographical tides, but rather a mixture of these and many other influences which have swept across the American scene. In many colleges these cultural elements have never been integrated into an effective pattern of action. Consequently, this lack of integration causes deep structural conflicts and chaotic experiences on the part of constituency, officers, teachers and students.

It then becomes the first task to try to identify and trace the various cultural factors which have evoked and influenced the liberal arts college, from its beginning in America with Harvard College in 1636 until the present time. The controlling cultural factors which have evoked, sustained, or modified the American liberal arts colleges, listed in the relative order in which they influenced the college, are:

1. *European college traditions.*—The founding of Harvard College in 1636, in America, set a pattern of higher education—drawn largely from northern European universities—which has been very influential in American culture. The nine colonial colleges which survived the Revolutionary War were—with the exception of the University of Pennsylvania due to Benjamin Franklin's influence—church controlled. Their curricula were traditional and their integration grew out of a pattern of theological interpretations based chiefly upon the Bible.

They had a revealed, theocratic Bible which gave them guidance and authority. They were not troubled with extra-curricular affairs, fraternities, social science, laboratory equipment, accrediting agencies or the search for meaning. Their values were traditional, revealed and specific. Their method was that of tradi-

tional indoctrination. Their pattern was ecclesiastical, centering in the church. The attendance in college was limited to the upper economic levels and strict, paternalistic supervision was given to each boy.

There was no more cooperation between these colonial colleges than between the various sectarian religious groups. Harvard disapproved of the founding of Yale; Princeton grew out of a controversy between two groups in the Presbyterian Church; Rhode Island College (Brown University) grew out of an intolerant New England attitude. The University of Pennsylvania grew directly out of a local sectarian spirit which refused George Whitefield a place to speak when he visited Philadelphia. Sectarianism was rife; cooperation was practically non-existent.

Thus, clearly reflected in the college process, the highest social values of the colonists are seen. As long as the minister was the most influential person in the colony, the college reflected that preference and produced ministers after the traditional patterns of theological education imported from the mother country. Gradually the education of lawyers, physicians, magistrates and teachers was added to that of ministers in the established colleges. But the curricula were still predominately traditional.

This early traditional European factor of culture has influenced American colleges tremendously. However, it is seldom found integrated with other factors of culture into a creative and functional educational pattern in the present college.

2. *American independence: democratic factors.*—The Revolutionary War was very upsetting to the American colleges. It found the alumni, teachers, and students divided in their loyalty. At the close of the war many new influences began to disturb the colleges. French "enlightenment," secularism and deistic philosophy became known in the colleges. Separation of church and state,

long advocated by the Baptists, later guaranteed legally, shocked the colonial colleges which had received great financial aid from colonial governments. Likewise, the educational and political philosophy of Thomas Jefferson began to take hold of the new nation and more demand was made of the church controlled colleges for popular control.

Georgia in 1785, North Carolina in 1789, and South Carolina in 1805, set up universities with less church domination. Some citizens of every state began to clamor for a state system of higher education. The Dartmouth College Decision of 1819, in which the United States Supreme Court granted Daniel Webster's plea that the Colonial Charter of his Alma Mater be declared legal and binding, was one of the turning points in the demand for state controlled higher education. George Washington had favored a national university and left some money in his will to be devoted to it. But jealousies of existing colleges helped defeat the plan.

By 1816, Jefferson had succeeded in securing Central College, which in 1819 became the University of Virginia. This truly represented the new type of state universities—which were to arise free above church control. However, even Jefferson did not expect the University of Virginia to be non-religious. He invited and firmly expected some church college to be founded near the University to teach religious and moral values to the students. Thus, a new trend was developed in the new university toward modern languages and the omission of theology entirely. The number of offerings in natural science and practical subjects was increased.

The expansion of public education in the United States has probably gone beyond any of the dreams of Jefferson's day. During the twentieth century the publicly controlled colleges and universities have clearly outdistanced the church-related institutions in enrollment, equipment and influence. This trend is

so dominant that Howard J. Savage, Secretary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, stated in 1933 that "the state has an obligation to assure its people that the quality of education available in any institution chartered by the state is good."

Although democracy is on the increase in the larger outreaches of the college program, internally the democracy practiced is probably becoming less and less, as the emergencies of the depression and the threat of totalitarian philosophies become widespread. Democracy cannot be made safe for the world unless it is first made safe on the college campus.

3. *An American frontier philosophy.*—The many influences of the frontier life in America upon the American colleges, from the earliest colonial period until the present, are poorly understood. Sweet said, "It was long the custom of Protestant ministers in the United States to speak of the discovery and colonization of North America as a providential event. . . . God appeared to have saved America for Protestants."

Likewise, the colleges experienced many mutations in this new land due, in part, no doubt to a separation from European culture and a self-reliance born of the extremities of culture in a new land. Encouraged by the "Northwest Ordinance of 1787" which guaranteed free schools, many New England families banded themselves together and settled in the West. Likewise, many church groups in the original states, finding the East too congested, trekked westward in search of economic and religious freedom. Thus not only did the church follow the frontier, but the liberal arts college was also implicit in almost every settlement on the frontier.*

3. See "Introduction" to Frederick J. Kelly and J. H. McNeely, *The State Higher Education* (New York: Carnegie Foundation & U. S. Office of Education, 1933), p. viii.

4. William W. Sweet, *The Story of Religions in America* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1930), p. 1.

Kirkpatrick traced the lay control of higher education to Yale in 1701, which spread to other colleges and eventually placed business men rather than educators in charge of American colleges. Oberlin College introduced the work plan for both white and negro students. It was the first college to introduce co-education (1837). Bethany College introduced the study of the English Bible as a required course. Bacon College offered practical courses in Surveying and Telegraphy. The frontier has produced many changes in the American colleges and the rapid multiplication of educational institutions from the kindergarten through the university has done much to keep alive the dream of universal education "from the cradle to the grave."

An indigenous frontier philosophy has emerged in the American universities and colleges which while defending individualism, freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom of the press, separation of the church and state and experimentalism has influenced the colleges and universities to make them more frontier than the geographical influences would warrant.

John Dewey stands out as the greatest educational philosopher produced by the American frontier. His influence has been dynamic and world-wide. His philosophy flows in the direction of empiricism and instrumentalism. It demands radical shifts in all areas of living. Dewey's theory would make of the colleges communities of shared living in democratic practice and learning.

4. *The Scientific factors.*—The influence of science began to be felt in the American college at about the close of the Civil War in 1865. This dazzling new way of interpreting life followed by its offspring, technology, has been the most disruptive cultural factor effecting the American college. Its full implications are not yet clear and only a few of

the more significant trends are traced.

At first the physical sciences were introduced into the liberal arts colleges and some disturbances were witnessed; but it was not until the biological sciences and later the social sciences began to gain strength in the colleges, undermining the ancient traditions of man's theological and social creeds, that real controversy arose. The controversies of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries seemed to gather then about the head of the colleges, but science grew in the curricula just as it increased in the larger social culture process. The "keen edge of analysis" invaded the church controlled college as well as the publicly controlled college; it was a dominant and world-wide movement.

The scientific method with its emphasis upon discovery rather than upon revelation, upon facts rather than upon tradition, upon laboratory technique rather than upon philosophical propositions, has been a revolutionary agent in the college throughout the last half century. The extreme paternalism of the earlier college officer was now definitely frowned upon. The student was supposed to become a mature, self-disciplined, laboratory technician—searching impassionately for knowledge. Factual information became the supreme end in education. This, combined with the elective system which came into vogue, gave students a very narrow and highly specialized field of study.

In recent years a few colleges have made some attempts to offset the dogmatism, naivete and narrow specialization of science teaching by instituting survey courses and building up the departments of philosophy and religion.

Thus, it is evident that the methods of science, creeping somewhat surreptitiously and piecemeal into the nineteenth century college curricula, but growing bolder with age, displaced the conventional patterns of theological, democratic and frontier culture and became dominant and, in many instances, domineer-

5. See Winfred E. Garrison, *Religion Follows the Frontier* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1931).

ing, in the twentieth century. The influence of science in the curricula of American colleges is yet in the ascendancy and its disregard for human values has been distressing. Science must re-evaluate its methods and basic assumptions in terms of high social values making for general human well-being, instead of being indifferent to human values. Colleges should use scientific techniques to help discover the highest values for religious and democratic living.

5. *The Economic factors.*—The liberal arts college has not escaped the rise and fall of the economic tides which have so powerfully shaped our modern culture. This last decade of depression has brought untold hardships upon all the schools; a few colleges have collapsed under the financial strain. In many colleges, acute problems of readjustment, salary and staff reduction, increased demand for education from students unable to finance their way, declining employment for graduates, and increased demand for utilitarian courses were some of the problems that taxed the strength of college administrators.

The present world scene presents no happy outlook for the liberal arts college. In the rapidly increasing human distress, in the confused world ideologies and excessive costs of war, in the economic struggles for the basic raw materials by clashing nations, there is not much relief in sight for institutions of higher education.

What the college administrators of the early nineteenth century did not foresee was the sudden rise of technology following in the steps of "pure" science, which would transform our continent into a mechanized aggregation of cities and industries, with an authoritarian "big business" domination. The college administrators were, like most American leaders, unable to predict and prepare for the World War period of 1914-1918 and the golden age of prosperity which came to an inglorious collapse in 1929. They did not fully reckon with the im-

pact of the "machine-age" and readjust their financial theory to master modern trends.

The negative attitude toward economic factors has caused great distress in many colleges. It initiated a false dualism between ideals and practice. It made the colleges inwardly condemn capitalistic philanthropy and yet privately seek it for survival. It bifurcated curricula into "vocational" and "cultural" areas without clarifying their interrelatedness.

The economic factors are still dominant in America in spite of or because of a decade of depression. American colleges cannot survive in any creative sense by assuming negative or acquiescent attitudes toward these imperialistic cultural elements. The colleges must take hold of these dangerous factors and make them serve mankind through democratic cooperative enterprises rather than permit them to menace the future of civilization.

6. *A Changing interpretation of religion.*—During the last half century there has emerged in Western culture a scientific understanding and interpretation of man which sees religion in terms of creative human adjustment to the expanding cosmic and social environment in a shared quest for more abundant life. This functional approach to religion, disregarding abstract theological and traditional interpretations, centers itself in the vital processes of human living in the pursuit of enriching human values, in the present process of human culture. Dr. E. S. Ames defines the task of religion:

"Religion is an evaluating attitude in which individuals of a group share. To this attitude some things are of highest importance and other things are of lesser value, or of no value at all. . . . At the present time the development of individual and social life, free and rich, is the evolving ideal. The specific features of this ideal are stated variously, and are yet vague and inarticulate, but it is in this direction that aspiration is moving

Criticisms of our time as materialistic and lacking in spiritual insight indicate the craving that marks all finer minds. Perhaps just this outreaching quest is to be the chief characteristic of the religion that is forming, rather than insistence upon settled codes of rules and standards. The task of religious education then becomes one of influencing people of all ages to share intelligently in this view, and in the effort to make it the chief end of thought and experimentation."⁶

7. *Other cultural factors.*—Many other factors in culture such as aesthetics, semantics, state and local politics, philanthropy, athletics, military training, and so forth, have had considerable influence upon the liberal arts colleges. However, they have not had a lengthy influence and many of these elements have been involved in the six dominant factors already described.

FRACTIONAL ACCOMMODATIONS TO CULTURE

Had the colleges at the beginning of the nineteenth century come together in some sort of "continental congress" to plan a program of higher education commensurate with the demands of a new continent—a continent of vast wildernesses and commingled cultures—much of our educational history might have been different. Instead the various uncontrolled factors in culture brought conflicts into the colleges themselves and the controversies over denominational or secular control of higher education made for fractional accommodation rather than orderly growth and progressive integrations.

Forced by common problems and sometimes threatened with extinction the various liberal arts colleges of regions or states are increasing their bonds of cooperation and finding integrative external patterns among themselves. Lloyd-Jones and Smith summarized our present situation when they said, "At present

there is no generally accepted philosophy of higher education."⁷

RELIGION IN THE COLLEGE

A survey of the status of religion in the present liberal arts colleges, as reflected in the surveys of the last two decades, presents a serious educational and moral problem. The traditional approach through required courses in religion and compulsory attendance at chapel is growing weaker and the new approach in terms of functional religion, based on science and democratic participation, is not effectively related to the process of education. Between these interpretations lies the moving life of the college in pursuit of values immediate, effective and popular. Religion on the campus is not for the most part creative and highly integrating; it is confused and confusing.

Recent surveys show that: courses in Bible and religion tend in most colleges to be segregated in a *department*. Sometimes they are grouped in a department with the courses in philosophy. There is some evidence that course offering in religion may be slightly on the increase in some colleges and universities. Church-related colleges require from 5 to 8 semester hours for graduation in some related field of religion. Courses in the social and personal application of religion to present-day problems are more elected than courses in Bible. Compulsory attendance at chapel is still predominate in the smaller colleges. There is a definite increase in providing religious counseling. Students seem to be greatly confused about their religious concepts, practices, and values. The organizational provisions for college students in religion are inadequate; they are poorly related to the educational program of the college. There is a tendency to place religion courses in a few colleges in the Humanities or Social Science divi-

6. Edward S. Ames, "Can Religion be Taught?" *Religious Education*, XXV (Jan., 1930), p. 43.

7. Esther Lloyd-Jones and H. Smith, *A Personnel Program for Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1938), p. 3.

sions."

Most freshmen claim membership in some church when entering college. Active participation during college years seems to decrease. Less than 10 per cent of the students enrolled plan to enter distinctly religious vocations.

RELIGIOUS INTEGRATION

The philosophy of education has lagged far behind practice until at present many institutions of higher learning exist and carry on in a traditional way without well-defined aims or a "central purpose" to guide them. Consequently, the college should have a philosophy of orderly and creative change if it is to direct cultural changes. In the face of a perturbed world, a more creative basis of integration is required in the liberal arts college which will work toward the rebuilding of the world and an integration of culture.

The theory of religious integration does not discredit the possibilities of integration growing out of art, philosophy, science and democracy but religion is held to be more comprehensive and synthesizing as well as more motivating and creative. Functional religion may help to interrelate diversity into a comprehensive and meaningful whole.

FUNCTIONAL RELIGION

Religion is as old as man himself but the function of religion in the culture has only recently begun to be understood. Consequently, it has been very slightly used in a conscious and intentional way as an effective method of redirecting the stream of human culture. It was the anthropologist, the psychologist, the sociologist and the philosopher of religion who freed religion from many traditional incrustations and described it as one of the indispensable integrating elements in culture. Through the contributions of men like Emile Durkheim,

William James, J. H. Leuba, W. K. Wright, Irving King, Edward S. Ames, George Albert Coe, William C. Bower, A. Eustace Haydon and Henry N. Wieman, religion is understood as a struggle of persons, individually and in groups, to find the most satisfying *values* of life for themselves and for all mankind. This search for values is always connected with a devotion to the highest values known or to be discovered.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION

Stated more specifically, the function of religion in the liberal arts college is to unite the administrators, teachers and students in a community of creative living and mutual learning in which a comprehensive and critical understanding of the present culture in terms of human values is achieved and commitment is directed not only toward the appreciation and utilization of the present values but also toward the improvement of culture, through the discovery, revaluation and integration of higher values for whole living, extended to all mankind.

In this formulation of religion, as a function rather than as an essence or as a subject-matter, an entirely new range of experimental possibilities is discovered. Religion's ability to secure integration may now be measured in terms of the whole college process. As subject-matter, religion influenced a very small proportion of the student body, but as a function it involves every person in the college. Religion should be identified as "a way of life" instead of a "field of knowledge" or a "discipline." Likewise, the identification of religion in the culture increases its accessibility for measurement as a quality of human experience. If religion is coextensive with all human experience—as a quality of the integrative struggle toward wholeness—then the college should become a laboratory of universal importance in the redirection of culture.

COOPERATIVE SEARCH FOR CONTEMPORARY VALUES

The acid test of any pattern of com-

8. The 21 liberal arts colleges which are united in the study of General Education under the direction of Ralph W. Tyler, The University of Chicago, tend to place religion in the Humanities Division.

munity life is its fruits both in the person, as a person, and in the social relationships. The functional college cannot permit auditors or mere spectators—every member of the community should be a worker improving his own living while assisting in the discovery and revaluation of values. The college should not be a retreat from responsibility or a moral holiday. Rather it is to be the laboratory where better techniques and ends for effective modern living may be sought. The college should not become a monastery or an "Ivory Tower," removed far from the pulse of the masses of men. Neither should it become a mart of trade or a country club. It should have vital community relations with the culture of the present age without being warped by that culture.

The uniting of administrators, teachers and students in the college in the mutual quest for the good life sets the pattern of a democracy in the field of higher education. Most colleges are now controlled by administrators who, with the general consent of the trustees, determine the policies of the school. Teachers are employed who are masters of fields of learning. The joint relationship of administrator, teacher and student immediately furnishes a cooperation and mutuality which democracy requires. Persons, as persons should gain self-respect in this shared program. Each person makes his contribution to the ongoing process, to the common life of the group, to the determination of means and ends according to his ability and maturity of thought. This mutuality will beget a high morale without which neither religion nor education becomes highly effective.

CRITERIA

Out of this theory of integration emerge the following criteria.

1. *THE ADEQUACY OF THE PURPOSE* is held because of its historical relation to the liberal arts traditions, the needs of the world culture, the needs of the student, the psychology of social

learning, the democratic participation and the integration that grows out of search for and commitment to common values.

2. *THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROGRAM* is held because the college organization and objectives are consistent with the purpose, the college becomes a community of living and learning, education is oriented toward persons in the present world, the curriculum is experimental, the administration is to facilitate growth, the faculty members direct the cooperative planning, the students are committed to a search for higher values and the financial assets and physical plant are adequate for this type of college.

3. *THE SATISFACTORY NATURE OF THE OUTCOMES* may be measured in terms of comprehensive and critical thinking, physical growth and health, emotional maturity, economic planning, social sensitivity, growth in appreciation, growth in progressive integrations toward higher values and new measurements of the total process to be discovered.

EVALUATIONS OF SIX INTEGRATIONS

Six general trends which are emerging in the field of higher education in the search for internal integration are evaluated below. Some of these trends have been developing in practice for several years without a thoroughgoing philosophy. Some are just emerging as embryonic theories and, as yet, are not explicit as to method or program. Some of these theories appear to be composites based upon older philosophical systems; they are not mutually exclusive.

(1) *Recovery of the pre-depression status.*—The recovery of the pre-1929 college is a dream which is unlikely of fulfillment. The pre-depression college was not highly integrated and a return to such status would not be satisfactory.

(2) *The revival of older syntheses.*—Metaphysics, theology and a God-centered curriculum imply a dependence upon a

priori or revealed values of the past for modern living. The first two center upon a "golden age" of the Middle Ages as a norm. They also neglect the full personality of the student in an attempt to cultivate intellectual virtues. Creative education does not center upon traditional values revealed or otherwise but seeks the good life in the present situation and discovers growing values adequate for the present and emerging human needs. College education should move ahead in a democratic and scientific spirit and not try to copy the past.

(3) *Vocational emphases.*—Antioch College illustrates this type of vocational experiment. The college has many excellent qualities; however the full import of cooperative education has not been reflected in the curriculum or in the administration of the college. This theory of education may be too close to the present economic order to be reconstructive in its philosophy or practice. A critical appraisal of the Antioch College philosophy and practice reveals the neglect of basic implications in the system.

(4) *Democratic emphases.*—Many colleges are trying to develop integration out of democracy. These experiments are not likely to become effective until the basic religious rootage of democracy is discovered. If democracy can clarify its values and develop a dynamic philosophy then it may become highly integrative in the college.

(5) *Scientific emphases.*—The College, of The University of Chicago, furnishes an illustration of how scientific concepts influence the purpose and methods of the college. The "New Plan" appears to be "to bookish" and too individualistic. There is a preponderance of emphasis upon the "mastery of leading ideas" with "the view to intelligent action" left unimplemented.

Education integrated through scientific method tends to break up into its constituent parts because science is not synthetic but analytic. Science, at best,

is not a frame-work-of-reference but a methodology. Science can enhance or destroy the culture of man. There must be a religious or philosophic basis of valuational direction before science can become a positive integration. The College described above is struggling to work out a consistent program to meet this integrative need, but a logical pattern has been adopted rather than a psychological pattern. The program as it now operates is not consistent with the theory of shared experience in the reconstruction of the culture.

(6) *Progressive education emphases.*—A number of colleges, such as George Williams College, Fenn College, Sarah Lawrence College and Bennington College, have moved sharply in the direction of "Progressive Education." They claim they have not arrived at a fulfillment of the theory but see the college as an experiment in a developing world. Sarah Lawrence and Bennington run the risk of over-individualizing the program. These "Progressive Education" colleges do not see clearly the functional use of religion as a possible operative integration for the colleges. They need to move more rapidly in this direction.

SOME ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The process of religious integration would operate in the college community to discover values for modern living in subject-matter, activities, organizations and in the patterns of living. All procedures of the college should be re-appraised in the light of this basis of integration and the objectives of the college would be the achievement of the common values held to be of supreme value by all the persons in the college. All subject-fields may yield valuable human values. In the traditional college the teachers of Bible and philosophy have been considered the custodians of values. Now in this process, the teachers of physical science, of social science and all other subject-matters are equally and mutually responsible for values. The problem of how to reorganize effectively

the subject-matter offerings to achieve this new all-inclusive purpose is a difficult, experimental undertaking.

The administrative officers and the faculty members of a college may initiate the process of religious integration by clarifying and stating the purpose of the college in terms of a few basic values, which they hold mutually, and which they desire to share with the students. These values should be thoroughly discussed and then stated simply in terms of desirable outcomes in students' experiences. The list of values should not be exhaustive and a perfected list is unnecessary. The list will be reconstructed as the process develops.

One or more basic values should be analyzed critically to see the method of revision in the college necessary for administration of courses, activities, counseling, social life—and the entire community pattern of living. The entire faculty should wrestle with this problem democratically, so that the planning which eventuates will also represent a consensus. Thus the values selected should be very broad and quite universal in appeal.⁹ Later it will be seen that these values must always be used as *hypotheses* and constantly subject to improvement.

A community of cooperative living and mutual learning cannot be created by superimposition or legislation. On the contrary, its growth is conditioned by the mutual sharing in a common cause. It is unlikely that high integration in an American college can be secured about any principle—revealed or discovered—which denies the principle of full democratic participation in the determination of the goal.

An experimental attitude should be developed in the college which will enable new ideas to be accepted as hypo-

theses and to be tested in actual experiments to demonstrate their value for the college. A series of faculty and student studies may be so interrelated that the entire college may become vitally interested in the experimental method in relation to the improvement of the educational process. Such a procedure is slow in growth but of great value.

The following method may be used in attempting to secure the whole-hearted cooperation of the board, the faculty, the students, the alumni and the constituency—since all are involved—in an experiment to test the validity of religious integration for the college. The college administrator in cooperation with the faculty or some faculty committee of the college may take these steps:

- (1) Make a critical study of the college in the light of the theory of religious integration.
- (2) Consult representatives of all the college groups concerning the experiment.
- (3) Initiate a series of cooperative studies to discover a plan of action.
- (4) Develop a limited experiment to clarify the procedure.
- (5) Formulate a whole-college experiment cooperatively.
- (6) Coordinate the many aspects into a consistent whole.
- (7) Provide for a continuous process of experimentation for the college.

THE PROGRAM OF RELIGION

As religion moves to the center of the college integrative process, in the search for and commitment to values, all teachers in the college should begin to feel a new responsibility for the whole college and the whole education of the students. Courses in religion should not fade out of the curriculum but instead become more integrally interrelated to all the courses. Subject-matter in religion may be integrated into the introductory divisional courses or run concurrently as an interpretative and integrating course.

9. It is suggested that basic social values be used to initiate the process such as: (1) Man Belongs in the Universe, (2) Every Person Should Discover Himself, (3) Every Person Should Discover Others, and (4) Every Person Should Seek to Discover the Supreme Value.

In the senior college a major should be offered; this will enable students to concentrate in a field of learning and also offer electives for the general student to pursue a liberal education. All courses in religion should have competent teachers and be integrally a part of the college curriculum. All courses should be functional and the operational nature of religion in the modern world should be stressed.

The organizations of religion on the campus should be indigenous and further the purpose of the college. The college should find experimentally how best to relate the persons in college to religious organizations in the larger community and in the world. The institutional practices of religion need thorough restudy and reorganization. They should arise spontaneously out of the work, the play, the sharing of common values and world causes; worship should not be stereotyped or superinduced. Carefully planned formal and informal group meetings may be used to dramatize and glorify the common values. A new religious movement may come out of the college community which may help to make organized religion more effective in meeting the needs of modern thinking men. But the task for religion is not complete without religious counseling which helps students to understand themselves and relate the many experiences of life to a personal hierarchy of growing values. In this intimate personal approach the students feel that they are understood and that they belong to a significant college community.

SUCCESSFUL LEADERSHIP

No philosophy of education can succeed without intelligent and aggressive leadership. The theory of religious integration, and the philosophy of education which grows out of a valuational, experience-centered process in contemporary culture, cannot revitalize the liberal arts college without intelligent and devoted leadership.

The theory of religious integration

which functions through a method which is democratically determined and scientifically guided would not favor a "dual administration" but instead a cooperative administration where the officers of the college and the faculty members unite with other interested groups of the college to further the basic purpose and the experimental program of the college. The president should be a creative leader rather than a dictator; he should delegate many administrative responsibilities; he should coordinate the work of the college and insist on a thoroughgoing democratic process in the administration of the college.

If the theory of religious integration is to be tested experimentally, the united leadership of the college should agree to cooperate with the experiment and accept personal responsibility for the outcomes. This would demand an extended period of deliberation, brief experiments to clarify the theory, and a thorough reorientation of the faculty, students and administration toward valuational, experience-centered education. Unless the combined leadership of the college is committed to a fair experimental testing of the theory, it is not likely to succeed fully. This does not mean that the college should delay the experiment until every faculty member is converted to the theory. Rather the faculty members should be experimentally-minded and agree to assist in testing out the merits of the theory which has been tentatively accepted by the majority of the faculty. A *consensus* is more democratic and religious.

The commitment on the part of the administrators, faculty members and student body to an experimental educational philosophy of college education—which grows out of the best scientific procedures, known or knowable, in search of whole integration for the college—constitutes an act of profound faith in the democratic way of life, and in the creative nature of man and the universe, which is of the highest, religious value.

EDUCATION, ECONOMICS AND DEMOCRACY

ROSS W. SANDERSON*

THE Educational Policies Commission, representing the collaboration of the National Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators, has produced a noteworthy series of reports. Three earlier volumes considered "The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy," "The Purposes of Education in American Democracy," and "The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy." Now comes a report, written chiefly by Dr. John K. Norton, entitled *Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy*.¹

One might expect this thin volume, which is attractively published by forces dependent on the established economic order, to voice a conservative viewpoint. As a matter of fact, in contrast with the timidity of the average taxpayer, this report looks out on a wide future through windows refreshingly open. In a time when many ecclesiasts are bemoaning the dominance of the secular in education this determinative statement of broad policies reveals the profoundly spiritual insights and aspirations of American public educators. Any objective reading of such a volume will force the reader to ask himself whether there would not be loss rather than gain if the divided forces of religion were to capture public education for "sacred" purposes. A presentation of this sort has its own inherent sanctions, which leave the sympathetic reader with a feeling of the profound sanctity of democratic education. Here is a truly American approach to the question of economic

determinism in its bearing on future generations.

The American ideal of universal education, greatly expanded during the last century, is now due for re-appraisal. Over against the popular view that education is increasingly expensive, education is receiving a decreased share of public funds. Meanwhile educators have been loaded with heavier and heavier responsibilities. It is the viewpoint of this report that education and economic well-being are interdependent. Its chief concern is with the question whether present economic conditions suggest the gradual restriction of free education or its further extension.

In our economy the intelligence and efficiency of labor vitally affect production. Educational opportunity which encourages the worker to rise through personal effort is therefore of special importance. Both generalized and specialized training are essential. Education promotes occupational mobility. Health education has demonstrable economic value. Only through education can the extremely perishable resources of capable man-power and easily wasted natural resources be adequately conserved. Capital can be developed through the educational extension of science and technology. Management, which is another crucial factor in modern economy, can be increased in effectiveness through education. As education increases productivity increases also, and the cumulative effect of the interrelation of the two may be conservatively assumed.

In a swiftly changing industrial age general education can continue to contribute to the evolution of a democratic economy by developing broad social intelligence on economic issues, by encouraging better understanding of industrial problems, by cultivating cooperative atti-

*Executive Secretary, Buffalo and Erie County Council of Churches, Buffalo, New York.

1. Educational Policies Commission, 1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., 1940. 227 pages.

tudes tending to increase economic well-being, by raising the level of general mechanical competency still further, and by greater encouragement of scientific competency. Some of these functions will be performed at all age levels, some only in the field of higher education, some principally in the elementary period.

All schools will need to give greater attention to the education of the consumer. Modern conditions make intelligent consumption so difficult that both consumer education and consumer coöperation are increasingly essential. Under our modern economy quantity production and advertising are held to permit a higher standard of living for the masses, and the educated consumer possesses high standards of value and taste. However, more specific training in the major areas of expenditure is essential, for wiser purchasing and consumption of food, for wiser spending for clothing, for wiser buying and renting of shelter (including furnishings and equipment), for wiser purchase of health (which is now a purchasable commodity), for better discrimination in avocational outlay, and for better understanding of the significance of public expenditures. "Reduced to its essentials, *public expenditure is coöperative buying.*"

Moreover, education is needed for wiser saving. Our superior ability to produce as compared with our inferior capacity to consume (due to inadequate purchasing power) is a matter to give us increasing pause. While consumer education has its technical phases, still more important is the fact that the educated consumer is sensitive to his social responsibilities. "As education is focused more directly upon areas of real life, of which the economic is an important one, it will make a stronger appeal to pupils. In practically all studies of why children leave school, lack of interest ranks next to economic reasons, which means that for large numbers the schools have failed in part."

The crux of the problem arises when one considers the particular kind of occupational education for economic well-

being that is required at each age level and in each local situation. At this point those who have gone the farthest in experiment and analysis are likely to be the most humble. Existing provisions for occupational education clearly need careful appraisal. Economic and vocational trends must be better known and understood. Manufacturing now requires more skilled and semi-skilled than unskilled workers. On the other hand it is equally true that many industrial jobs now require little formal vocational training. The worker needs adaptability rather than skill. While the relation of mechanization to skill in manufacturing needs further study, there appears to be a shortage of certain types of skilled workers and the proportion of all workers possessing skill and technical knowledge is increasing.

Occupational education must take account of important social trends. Schools and colleges must know where vocational opportunity is most likely to occur, and what preparation for embracing it is essential. Broad rather than narrow terms should be employed, and coöperation with other agencies should be guided by considerations of individual and social welfare based on a foundation of accurate, comprehensive, and continuing information. Guidance services of a high caliber are required. These must be carefully adjusted to the functional requirements of various age levels, and should make use of adequate criteria in the selection of occupations for which training is offered. The problem of occupational obsolescence and how to meet it or prevent it must be kept constantly in mind. With a growing number of persons entering the professions it is evident that "the value of higher education, as it affects general culture, economic, and occupational well-being can be substantially increased."

This is of prime importance. "The very existence of our enormously productive industrial economy would be impossible if the population of the United States were illiterate, ignorant, and occupationally unskilled. Universal public education par-

allels the development of the democratic, industrial state and makes indispensable contributions to its maintenance and progress."

Education costs money. How much education can be afforded? What is the relation of educational costs to economic well-being? Sufficient education must be provided to achieve occupational efficiency. Doubtless all would agree to this point. It may not be quite as clear at first blush that sufficient education must be provided to permit occupational mobility. The report contends that schooling should be provided under such conditions that persons who should have the schooling are not debarred from it by financial reasons. Effectively free education is held to result in a more efficient population with increased productivity. "To the extent that this results in increased income over and above the cost of education, the total national income is augmented."

If too many are trained for occupations where income is largest, will there be a shortage of unskilled labor, and will there be a shortage of jobs for the skilled? This report does not think so. A technological society is held to require a decreasing percentage of hewers of wood and drawers of water. Mechanical slaves are substituted for human workers. It is also held that both the number and the ratio of skilled workers tends to increase in a society that trains its workers technically and professionally. From a strictly financial standpoint, "as long as reductions in the numbers of unskilled workers and increases in skilled workers tend to raise the total income of a country, this process should go on. It should be allowed to continue until the cost of training equals the extra value of additional goods and services produced." So long as additional schooling tends to reduce extremes in income, it would seem justifiable. Persons with larger amounts of schooling generally have larger earnings. Accordingly, our economy calls for further extension of educational opportunity, conditioned only by human capacity.

Immediate goals suggested are a universal minimum of compulsory school attendance of at least ten years and the increase of the average amount of schooling to fourteen years.

Because lack of finances due to low family income is a major cause of withdrawal from high school and debars many students from college, many students of superior capacity and diligence are denied educational opportunity. Student aid from private sources keeps many in school, and selected students from low income families make superior college records. Accidents of geography condition educational opportunity, as does rural or urban residence. So does race. This fortuitous distribution of educational opportunity has disastrous economic effects. "Wise public policy urges that this undemocratic and uneconomic situation be corrected as rapidly as possible through the right kind of effectively free education."

Extension of educational facilities should be guided by social and economic needs. The bases for selecting youths for advanced training should be improved. Individual ability should guide this selection. Student aid should imply honor and responsibility. Proper occupational distribution need not involve regimentation. Educational and occupational standards would rise together, were education effectively free.

While it is difficult to estimate what all this would cost, certain figures are presented. In any case the poorest schools should be lifted to some reasonable minimum of quality and cost. Effectively free education should be gradually developed and its cost should be shared by many agencies.

The report assumes our ability to pay the bill, and gives reasons for this assumption. Existing industrial plants and equipment are not fully utilized. Production can be increased. Consequent gains in national income can be expected. Revenue systems can be more equitable and adequate. Fiscal resources must be pooled.

Units of attendance and administration must be reorganized.

To accomplish this promptly, public understanding and action must be secured. Democratic ideals and economic welfare are at stake. A new vision of education as a method of democratic progress is involved. Better bases of appraising public expenditures must be developed. Occupational distribution must be soundly viewed. High standards and occupational mobility are both possible. Effectively free schooling promises more equitable distribution of earned income. Sound economic education will benefit private business enterprise. Educational statesmanship will need to be exercised, professional standards of administration are required, and participation by all agencies of community enlightenment is essential. There is no

royal road to wise public policy and action, but positive action on the program proposed can be the product of dynamic citizenship, in which statesmanlike leadership and intelligent rank and file response are complementary elements.

Such, in quotation and paraphrase, is the burden of the book. One glimpses in it the general method by which literacy can be expanded into increasingly effective universal education, in a land more and more homogeneous as to opportunity. Here is the American dream digging in for the long war against low cultural standards and spotty educational progress. One glimpses down such a vista the sacredness of the individual personality, recognized, conserved and developed for the common good. This is economics come alive in terms of public education.

BOOK REVIEWS

BELL, BERNARD I., *Understanding Religion*.

Dr. Bernard Iddings Bell has made a much needed contribution to the upper age levels in his study of the Christian Religion. *Understanding Religion* for the senior in secondary school or the freshman in college. In the student's notebook which accompanies his text, he has taken advantage of a modern pedagogical device as a supplement. However, there is danger that the student may be surfeited with this type of work.

That Dr. Bell is a teacher is shown by his understanding of the classroom needs. He lists supplementary reading for the teacher, and suggests means of varying procedure. When Bible selections are to be read a "learner previously warned" is chosen. He cautions against "rubbing it in"—showing understanding of the later adolescent.

There are suggestions on the technique of prayer, on a rule of life, on preparation for Holy Communion which would appeal especially to those young people who are drawn toward the contemplative but who lack knowledge of the method for such an approach. The Case Histories in the appendices would prove a challenge to any group of young people and provoke thoughtful discussion.

Although the appeal is definitely sectarian, teachers in denominations other than the Episcopalian would find helpful resource material for young people's groups or for Confirmation Classes. They would find very valuable the concise and scholarly presentation in such chapters as those on the social creed of the Church, on the origin and development of the Church, and on Holy Week.

Ray L. Leland.

BIXLER, JULIUS S., *Religion for Free Minds*. Harper, \$2.50.

In the author of *Religion for Free Minds* liberal religion has a worthy champion. Recognizing the rising tide of irrationalism and supernaturalism, he meets it with the strong counter-current of reason. He sees no occasion for the human mind to abdicate its function and insists that the powers of the mind should be exercised in the sphere of religion. But "liberal religion remains a matter of faith and not knowledge, but it is the kind of faith which finds its nearest analogy in the struggle of life to go forward and to achieve a vantage-point from which its own impulses can be judged."

The case for liberal religion, the author contends, requires emphasis on two neglected aspects, dualism and process. "The dualism is one of relation, not of exclusion—of interaction, not of ultimate separation," and is to be noted as ultimately characterizing men's approach to God which includes both knowledge and a "sense of warmth about the heart"—reason and feeling. The fact of process is apparent to the liberal who believes that "criticism and debate are needed, as well as commitment because reality is on the move and God's purposes have no fixed way of making themselves known." No one can escape the fact of change. "His own life changes, the world changes, God changes—yet the liberal believes that the change itself testifies to the permanence of that by which the change is known and evaluated." The process is in the change as growth toward the permanent.

After describing present trends toward unreason as represented by the Barthians in particular, the author presents the case for liberalism. He makes William James the spokesman for the cause. "A great liberal himself, James shows that the liberal attitude means not hesitating vacillation, but decisive action. Nor is the liberal a bookish spectator, living in a world of ideas, but rather an eager participant who feels deeply on all the important issues and loyally takes sides." The action takes the form of fighting for the right with greater regard for effort in the direction of ultimate good than for full and final achievement.

The values for which the struggle is carried on have been proclaimed by three of the world's greatest thinkers: Santayana, John Dewey, and Royce. To the question, "Which desire has a right to be satisfied?" Santayana offers as his answer the "self-justifying experience of contemplation" which brings "a transport akin to the sense of beauty." John Dewey replies with his emphasis on goodness which eventually must become effort directed toward the social good. Royce gives his answer in the form of the search for truth.

In his chapter on "The Religious Process and its Rhythm" the author discusses the pendulum-like swing from knowledge to feeling and the necessity for establishing an harmonious relationship between them. He concludes with a challenging question, "Can Liberal Religion, Then, Be Made Effective?" He answers his own interrogation in the affirmative but not without the conviction that for liberal religion to become effective both religious education and worship must change their form and content to become increasingly a "response to goodness, beauty and truth, not as detached cultural essences, but as parts of an ongoing process of existence which summons us to participation."

This book is a significant contribution as an offset to a defeatist and discouraged mood. It resists the trend to retreat from the front line where the mind grapples with reality. It welcomes the contributions of science, and exalts the vitality of creative religion for times like these. We are not given easy reading, but those who are unwilling to abdicate their positions as searchers for truth and beneficiaries of a growing faith will find much here to reward and reassure them.

Norris L. Tibbetts.



BLACKWOOD, ANDREW W., *Preaching from the Bible*. Cokesbury, 247 pages, \$2.00.

How shall the pulpit deal with the critical problems of the Bible? In much of our popular preaching there is a pseudo-scientific attempt to prove the literal truth of the biblical narratives, often with appeal for faith that God will so act today. Critical scholarship is earnestly attempting to present the Bible as a literature that

grew out of the religious experience of men of rare spiritual power, who, of necessity, expressed their faith in the thought-forms of the pre-scientific age. Miracles have the spiritual value of parables, the God who acts immediately in the affairs of men becomes the God of the moral process.

Dr. Blackwood follows neither of these methods. He is not unaware of the critical problems, but he ignores them. He does not contend for the factual truth of the Bible, but he never questions it. He advises not to preach about a book but to preach the message of the book. Thus, in treating the book of Jonah, he would put emphasis on the glorious universalism there proclaimed and make no discussion of the great fish. He would preach on the picturesque stories of Daniel, but would never raise the question of fact. But what of the hearer who does raise that question? Is not the biblical preacher shirking a responsibility when he fails to help the layman to understand the real character of these narratives? That it can be done without loss of spiritual power is abundantly proved by men who are making a modern use of the Bible.

Dr. Blackwood's homiletic treatment is admirable. The beginner in the pulpit will find most helpful suggestions for biblical preaching that will give beauty, variety and power to his message, and the veteran will be led to review his own practice and to realize more keenly what the Scriptures have to bring to the needs of our troubled day.

Theodore Gerald Soares.



Faith for Today, a Symposium by Stanley High, Frank Kingdon, Gerald Walsh, Louis Finkelstein, and Swami Nikhilananda. *Town Hall Press* and *Doubleday Doran*, \$2.00.

This is another of the rapidly multiplying symposia on religion. The immediate cause of this publication was a series of five lectures on religion given as part of the Town Hall series in New York City. Five religions speak through their representatives. Each speaker feels that religion is being challenged today as perhaps never before, but each one also feels that his is the best. In each is a bit of propa-

ganda. Protestantism, Romanism, Judaism, and Hinduism each states its case. George V. Denny, Jr., President of Town Hall, tries to point out in his postscript the great common ground of religious belief to which all religions can subscribe—but his essay is, for the most part, wishful thinking. The different interpreters of religion do not want to declare that all are equal. This symposium adds nothing to the movement toward unity.

Stanley High, who speaks first for the great Reformed System of faith, levels a lengthy invective against the isms that happen today to be our political enemies. But this is a day of surprising friendships, and tomorrow he may feel that he must find arguments in another direction. We shall never make any gains by negative attack. When he gets down to his subject, Mr. High declares that "the more important thing required of us is the rediscovery of what our religion—above this intimate personal level—is all about." Just so! But one comes to the end of his Town Hall lecture with the feeling that he still has much to seek.

Frank Kingdon is the second speaker for Protestantism. He states with modest honesty at the beginning of his lecture that he finds it "difficult to write about religion with complete honesty." All of these writers find the same difficulty because they attempt to give the impression of a common basis of faith, when they know it is not their desire to have it so.

Father Walsh, a Jesuit, speaks for the Church of Rome. Skilfully he reviews certain Protestant writers—Lewis Mumford, Edwin E. Aubrey, and Kenneth S. Latourette—and then proceeds to imply their deficiencies in the light of his own church which, of course, he holds to be the only true religion.

Dr. Finkelstein speaks modestly for Judaism. In general terms about the war and democracy he leads up to the Old Testament and finally ends with a word about science and scholarship. He will convert nobody to Judaism, but he still holds to Pharisaic and Rabbinic Judaism. The casual reader, however, may think it is a lost cause.

Swami Nikhilananda comes as a refreshing breeze in this desert of vague ideas. He believes in Hinduism with such

cogency that he really might make converts. It is doubtful if the average reader has ever heard a non-Christian religion explained with such cogency and charm. His text is "the secret of happiness is in perfect unselfishness." And these words form a rebuke to all that has gone before.

In his postscript Mr. Denny tactfully suggests seven "common denominators" for the "faiths" discussed. But these seven points one cannot find in the lectures. They are, however, so important that they should be enumerated.

1. Faith in God, as Spirit, Creator, and Ruler of the universe.

2. Faith in man, as a reflection of God's Spirit, possessed of a soul through which he is related to God and the universe.

3. Faith in life after death.

4. Faith in man's moral judgment, as springing direct from God, rather than a rationalized expediency.

5. Faith in the golden rule.

6. Faith in prayer and meditation.

7. Faith in a democracy based on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

C. A. Hawley.



GOODSPEED, EDGAR J., *How Came the Bible?* Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York. 148 pages. \$1.50.

Once again Dr. Goodspeed has demonstrated his unusual capability for interpreting the findings of modern biblical scholarship in the language of the average reader of the Bible. To his well-known series—*The Story of the New Testament*, *The Story of the Old Testament*, *The Story of the Apocrypha*, and *Christianity Goes to Press*—this new work on *How Came the Bible?* is a worthy addition. In it Dr. Goodspeed tells how the several books of the Bible, once written, "came to be gathered into the great religious libraries we know as the Old and New Testaments, and the Apocrypha, and how these have come down the centuries to our own day." Material which has been familiar to biblical scholars for many years now is made available to all.

This history of the collection, preservation, selection, transmission and translation of the Bible is written in thirteen chapters. Three of these deal with Old

Testament materials, one with the Apocrypha, three with New Testament materials, four with manuscript discoveries and translations. The other chapters are given over to introductory and review material. *How Came the Bible?* is an excellent study book for use in the church school or for special projects in religious education. The value of this volume as a study book is enhanced by the questions which are appended to each chapter and by the fine bibliography which is added to guide further study.

Both the casual reader and the careful student will welcome this work. It maintains the high standard of scholarship for which its author is recognized and, at the same time, it sets forth the significant facts in this long drama of biblical transmission in an interesting and non-technical style. Ministers, religious educators, discussion leaders and laymen will find this a valuable help in answering the familiar query, "How came the Bible?"

Irvin E. Lunger.



LANZ, HENRY, *In Quest of Morals*. Stanford University Press, 1941. \$3.50.

Professor Lanz wrote this essay for a contest which was sponsored by certain Scandinavian publishers in 1936. The question was: "Can an objective moral standard be set up for the present age; and if so, on what is it to be based?" Professor Lanz won the prize, and translations of his book have already been published under the titles *Den etiska objektiviteten* (Swedish) and *Relativitetsmoral* (Norwegian).

If Professor Lanz's treatise is as important as the prize essays of Kant and Rousseau, it will be because of an ingenious generalization of the mathematics of physical relativity. The author believes that rival ethical standards can, with the help of a vector formula, be translated into one another. He does not, however, think that he has a formula for overcoming practical disagreements at the present time, nor is he under the illusion that "universal harmony can be established in such a demurely academic manner as by writing a book." (page 2) His discussion of the "logic of relativity and the 'ethics of relativity'" is difficult, but stimulating. His

method of discovering an objective ethical value is unquestionably original, although the objective value, for which he is groping, seems to be quite as formal as the ethical universals which have been declared by previous students.

The last chapter of the essay is much less technical than the earlier chapters. Indeed, it is so much less technical that the reader may wonder whether the author is using any of the technical apparatus which he has previously prepared. Nevertheless, Dr. Lanz makes some acute observations on the contemporary moral situation. He thinks that attempts to "save" religion, democracy and individualism are futile, to the extent that social and economic conditions have changed since those institutions were born. Nevertheless, he is convinced that religion (in a rather unorthodox sense) is demanded by "our age." He sees a tendency for values to be transformed by the increasing participation of the masses in the goods of life. But he does not expect the battle between empty words (the antiquated moral standards) and circumstances to result in an a-moral life. He is sure that new moral standards are emerging; he thinks they are, in some sense, democratic, pacifist and hedonist; but Dr. Lanz does not make it clear just how his general formula helps to sharpen these impressions. Nor is it clear that a formula which identifies the highly formal similarities between warring ideologies in our age reveals anything whose objectivity is very important.

In commenting on the inconclusiveness of the author's main thesis I am not uncovering a defect of which the author is unaware, for he explicitly disclaims any pretension of finality. He regards his work as that of giving direction to further study rather than as a solution of common problems.

Wayne A. R. Leys.

LEYS, WAYNE A. R., *Ethics and Social Policy*. Prentice-Hall, 522 pages, \$4.00 (trade); \$3.00 (school).

Here is a new and original way of teaching ethics, namely, by analyzing difficulties that are inherent in social policies upon which there is not unanimous agreement. These difficulties are

shown to involve us in questions of means and end; the meaning of "good," "right," and "duty"; the functions of law and of ideals; the conflicting standards of hedonism, self-realization, and rationality; free will and determinism; and—the central theme—the problem of an inclusive and final good that could be the ground of self-consistency and of social harmony. The author holds that no such final goal of life can be identified; that ethics is through and through relative; that ethical conflict is unavoidable, and that always the best that is possible is some sort of compromise. Consequently, in conflict situations the most significant persons are bystanders, because, having no interest of their own in the rightness or wrongness of either party, they are in position to promote peace, or law and order, by inducing all the contenders to waive something of their claims. Out of this bystander function springs a sort of *Führer-prinzip*. Human beings in general are not capable of grasping the grounds of their agitation; only superior persons can do it, and even they are incapable of the inclusive intelligence that dictatorship has to assume.

The chief significance of the volume, I should say, lies in the fact that it gives to right-at-hand obstacles to ethical action the place that usually is occupied by direct exposition of general principles and the defense of them upon general grounds. The main conflict areas that Leys chooses for treatment are economic individualism vs. socialism; sex; socialized medicine, and labor relations. His analyses often are acute, more often provocative. In all of them he takes the position—or thinks he does—of the non-partisan bystander. Upon his success in doing so depends, according to his own logic, the general validity of the ethical outlook that his volume offers. At several points, however, his bystander status seems to be not above question. First, from the prevalence of inconsistency and conflict, which is a matter of observation, he moves on somehow to the inevitability of it, which is not a matter of observation. I do not see how this transition can be made except by employing a value judgment that is unacknowledged but is contested. Second,

at some points he indicates what he thinks is valid in this or that dispute between "partisans"—valid not merely as a statement of fact but also as a value judgment. A reader who cared to do so could discover in the author himself enough rooted convictions to classify him among those whom he calls "partisans." Third, he classifies as "partisans" all persons who disagree with anybody else—this regardless of the content of their respective policies. I should say that a partisan is one who is for a part rather than a whole, and that even a class conflict might be directed towards a classless end. Moreover, the author's use of the term "partisan" makes him one as soon as anybody opposes him. Fourth, at some points his information is more limited than the functions of his "bystander" permits. For example, though he explains that he intends to say little about Russia because of the difficulty of securing reliable information, he does not find it impossible to offer numerous conventionalized opinions about things Russian! Even his remarks about American socialism would scarcely suggest to anyone who has read Harry Laidler that an adequately informed bystander is looking on.

George A. Coe.

* * *

PALMER, LALA C. and LEON C.. *The Churchman and the Kingdom.*

The Episcopal Church School uses a unified course of study called *The Christian Living Series*. For the third year of the Junior Course, the Palmers have written a text, *The Churchman and the Kingdom*, consisting of two books—one for the pupils and the other a guide for the teacher. The emphasis in this year of work is upon preparation for Confirmation and the text is correlated with the Catechism. *The Churchman and the Kingdom* has made a re-study (always an excellent technique) of the entire Catechism, explaining, illustrating, and applying its terms to the everyday life of boys and girls.

The Second Quarter gives an unusually clear and specific explanation of the Ten Commandments and their direct relation to the lives of children. This part would prove helpful in any denomination. The

chapter, "How Did We Get the Apostles' Creed?" paints within its two pages a clear and vivid picture of early Christianity.

Unfortunately, in spite of its effective organization, the book does not give help to the teacher as to methods of procedure. It does not state how the pupil's text is to be used. If the books were in the hands of any but a very clever teacher, the work would tend to become monotonous with its strained effort to make a realistic appeal to the twelve year old. The same result could have been attained with a less artificial setting. As a whole, the methods suggested are not equal in value to the clear-cut information and explanation.

Ray L. Leland.

* * *

PHILLIPS, WILBUR C., *Adventuring for Democracy. Social Unit Press, 1940.*

Those who have bemoaned the loss of opportunity, adventure, and gritty gumption suffered because of the passing of the American physical frontier may cease their moaning and lift their eyes to a limitless horizon. Wilbur C. Phillips, in this exciting book, recounts the more important of his pioneering experiences on the rather recently apprehended American wilderness, the social frontier.

Indeed, the hazards of the physical frontier are tame compared with those of the social frontier when one considers the complications introduced by conflicting interests between human individuals. The fears, the greed, graft, inertia, complacency, ambitions, and love of power which accompany the enterprises of men in a keenly competitive, capitalistic society are no mean factors to deal with when one sets out to establish such conditions as will foster the growth of democracy in the undertakings of the every day instead of being satisfied with it in the verbal hurrahs on patriotic holidays. Mr. and Mrs. Phillips, no less than the pioneers on the geographical frontier, put their cause ahead of their comfort or possessions. Much of the time they lived the from-hand-to-mouth existence which we have associated with pioneer life on a very rugged geographical frontier. They were befriended, too, just in the nick of time, on many, many occasions. Yes, this book is a thriller from the American social

frontier!

Three experiments are described in the book, one in New York City, one in Milwaukee, and the third in Cincinnati, each one incorporating the previously explored social territory and then breaking new ground beyond. The total time during which these three experiments were actually in operation was not very long, but when the three with their analytical periods in between are considered as phases of one larger experiment, the time is considerable.

The account of the work in Milwaukee is in one way the most striking of the three, for it reveals more directly and intimately the detailed steps by which one district became a democratic neighborhood. The reader *feels* the growth taking place more vividly. But the account of the work in Cincinnati causes one to lose track of time because of the remarkable nature of the transformations which took place in the selected district, and the speed of these changes. It is another demonstration of the fact that mankind cannot *make* growth. They can only provide the conditions which either block or facilitate it. When mankind provides facilitating conditions, the results seem like a miracle. The best of life is always ready to burgeon into fullness of expression when we replace obstructing conditions with reinforcing ones. What happened in the Mohawk-Brighton district of Cincinnati is this sort of miracle. The news of it should travel far and fast, and give hope to ailing, destitute, and graft-paralyzed communities.

The basic theory motivating and shaping the experiments grew as the explored ground was extended. Gradually there emerged the Social Unit Plan, a "potential substitute for existing political government, . . . not only for existing municipal departments and government, but also for volunteer agencies." Yet this new order would be achieved without violence or revolution in any degree, and without taking production out of the hands of those whose experience and investment qualify them for efficient production of the goods to satisfy human needs. In brief, it is achieved by providing the conditions whereby the democratic process actually works in the midst of unit neighborhoods, and actually keeps these

in balanced functional relationship with agencies of production on the one hand and with larger units of citizens, including national political bodies, on the other hand.

There is nothing "Communitistic" or "Socialistic" about it, in the "Big Bad Wolf" sense. It is the purest Democracy at work that one could hope to find. It would work changes, and basic changes. But these would better the condition and enjoyment for every one. Even the relations between production, distribution, and consumption are developed on a *practical* democratic basis, considerate of the interests and will of all concerned.

The book ends with the announcement of the forming of the Organizing Committee for Social Union to promote social union based upon the 1940 model of the Social Unit Plan.

Regardless of one's particular point of view, this book merits a place on the "required reading" list, first, of all who are truly interested in the democratic way of life, and second, of all who are working with groups of people, teachers, pastors, and community leaders in various undertakings. These are the closing words: "Can we pioneer more nobly, now, than to rescue beleaguered democracy in the only way it can be rescued—by vindicating our belief in it, by *demonstrating* to a world distraught both its spiritual power and the material abundance it can yield?"

Regina Westcott Wieman.



RUTHVEN, ALEXANDER G., *Youth in the World of Today. Public Affairs Committee*, 8 W. Fortieth, New York. 40 pages, 10 cents.

Dr. Ruthven, president of the University of Michigan, is responsible for the statement that it is important for society to avoid the neglect of adults, but that it is positively dangerous for it to thwart the ambition of youth to reform the world. He further states that only the schools which act on this belief are educational institutions in the best meaning of the term.

This study should be read very carefully by all social workers, but more particularly by those who are directly concerned with the future of American youth.

The pamphlet contains many striking statements, among them:

1. That the number of young people out of work, for the country as a whole, is estimated at about 4,700,000. This means that over one-third of all the unemployed in the country are between the ages of sixteen and twenty-four.

2. That we think of youth as a period when health is at its peak, yet three-fourths of the school children have physical defects of one kind or another, and one-fifth of the young men applying for the army and navy are rejected because of physical weaknesses.

3. That accidents are the most frequent causes of death for the youth of both sexes, automobiles accounting for 39 per cent of all accidental deaths, and that about one young person out of five has syphilis or another social disease.

4. That it is estimated that families with incomes of less than \$2,500, which includes at least three-fourths of the population, receive only about half the medical and dental care that they need.

5. That our colleges and universities had less than 250,000 students in 1900 and that in 1937 the number had grown fivefold.

6. That scores of new jobs have opened up. Radio announcers, transport pilots, and aerial engineers were undreamed of thirty years ago. Other occupations such as cabinet makers and manual bookkeepers are disappearing. The occupations that remain are changing rapidly. There are today dozens of kinds of engineers and doctors, many of which were unknown a generation ago.

7. An observation of singular significance, particularly to community center workers, is the fact that in New York less than 4 per cent of a group of ex-high school students stated that teachers, principals or counselors had helped them choose their occupations. The task faced by the school is a hard one. It involves not only adequate, reliable information about occupations, but also careful analysis of the mental qualities, skill, and traits of personality needed for success in each instance. Then there is the difficult task of studying each individual to determine his special capacities. Vocational guidance does not necessarily aim at fitting a square

peg into a square hole. It does not necessarily try to find the one job for which the young person is best fitted. It realizes that vocations do not stand still, and that people change with years. It also recognizes that there are usually a number of jobs in which any one person can succeed. Nor do mere suggestions with regard to jobs mean much, unless the school is prepared to follow them up.

8. Only one youth out of thirteen, now employed, is engaged in professional or technical work. Not many more than one-third are in white collar jobs of any kind, and the majority are in domestic service, unskilled, or semi-skilled labor or employed on relief projects.

9. The national youth administration is employing more than 470,000 young people on its student aid and works program. Part-time jobs are provided for about 315,000 needy students in high school, college and university to enable them to continue their studies. In addition, about 150,000 young people who have left school are employed on special public work projects.

10. Many of the simple outdoor amusements of earlier years are no longer possible, either in the country or the city. The "ole swimming hole" no longer exists. A quiet walk down a country road is no longer quiet or safe. Home amusements are not as easy to plan as they once were. A flat in the slums is not large or attractive enough for even small social gatherings. Expensive apartments are often not much larger. Young people, therefore, have little choice but to look outside of the home for their fun. This observation is a direct challenge to the community center leader.

11. The problem is made harder by the fact that young people have much more time on their hands than their fathers and mothers did at the same age. We have seen that there are millions of young people out of school and out of work who have little, if anything to do. Thousands of others work only part time, while those with full-time jobs have shorter hours than formerly prevailed. Since most young people have little money, the finding of satisfactory recreation represents a very real problem, comparable to that of finding a job.

12. No clubs exist for large numbers of young people. Most that do exist are for boys. A survey of 8,000 girls in California revealed that only 15 per cent were members of clubs. The shortage of clubs is most acute for young people from 18 years of age on. High School youth are well organized, but when they leave school they also leave their clubs. Since they are not ready for adult organizations, and cannot afford their own, the majority stay outside altogether. That there is a special need for co-educational groups is shown by the experience of the Y's and the recent spontaneous development of "cellar clubs" in some of our larger cities.

13. The problem of the young criminal is obviously distinct from that of the older criminal. For youth crime often starts out as a lark; for the older criminal it is an occupation. If the two are mixed, the prison becomes a trade school in which the professional gangster becomes the teacher.

14. If the American economic situation should get worse, youth might very easily be stampeded into Fascism, as it has been in other countries; but with proper education and leadership, youth can also be rallied to the defense of our democratic institutions. But if this is to be achieved, the democratic ideal must be restated in terms as dynamic as those put forth by the dictatorships. So far this has not been done. It is essentially not so much a task for youth as for the generation that has enjoyed the fruits of freedom.

Philip L. Seman

SMITH, J. M. P., and IRWIN, WILLIAM A., *The Prophets and Their Times.* University of Chicago Press, 1941, \$2.50.

The student of prophecy will welcome the revised edition of the book by Dr. Smith which came off the press first in 1925, and which has been revised by one who was first his student and later his colleague. To one who studied the first edition the second comes after sixteen years with the same interest that one feels in meeting an old friend after this lapse of time, to find his former acquaintance improved by the addition which the years have added. For during these sixteen years there has been much advance

in the field of Old Testament research.

The main body of the book is to no small extent the same as it came from the pen of Dr. Smith, but the reviser had the good fortune to receive from Mrs. Smith the personal copy of the first author, in which he had himself penned many suggested revisions.

The reviser marks out the chief differences which the reader will find in the present volume, namely that he does not "follow the well worn path and that he sets himself against the prevailing view that the prophets were ecstasies." The second difference which is especially noteworthy in this revision is to be found in the treatment of the book of Ezekiel where "the work of revision has been most extensive."

The volume sets the prophets in their own background and against the forces of their own lives; but the message of these men of old to these days of strife comes with a vigorous note through the entire volume.

G. E. Clary.

* * *

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACTS OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AND MARCH 3, 1933

Of Religious Education published quarterly at Mount Morris, Illinois for October 1, 1941.
State of Illinois, ss.
County of Cook.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Laird T. Hites, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the editor of the Religious Education and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, as amended by the Act of March 3, 1933, embodied in section 537, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Religious Education Association, 59 E. Van Buren St., Chicago; Editor, Laird T. Hites, 59 E. Van Buren St., Chicago; Managing Editor, Laird T. Hites, 59 E. Van Buren St., Chicago; Business Manager, Laird T. Hites, 59 E. Van Buren St., Chicago.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) Religious Education Association, 59 E. Van Buren St., Chicago. A corporation organized not for profit. No stockholders.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: There are none.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holders appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 22nd day of September, 1941.

(SEAL)

CORNELIA RUSSEY.

(My commission expires October 1, 1942.)

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION STANDING COMMITTEES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ERNEST J. CHAVE, Associate Professor
of Religious Education, University of
Chicago, Chairman.

MORTON M. BERMAN, Rabbi, Temple
Isaiah Israel, Chicago.

HEDLEY S. DIMOCK, Dean, George Wil-
liams College, Chicago.

KENNETH L. HEATON, Professor, North-
western University.

LEO L. HONOR, Executive Director,
Board of Jewish Education, Chicago.

VERGIL E. LOWDER, Minister, New First
Congregational Church, Chicago.

OTTO MAYER, Director of Research, In-
ternational Council of Religious Edu-
cation, Chicago.

RUTH SHRIVER, Board of Education,
Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

HARRISON S. ELLIOTT, Union Theological
Seminary, New York City, Chairman.

STEWART G. COLE, Service Bureau for
Intercultural Education, New York.

SAMUEL L. HAMILTON, New York Uni-
versity.

C. IVAR HELLSTROM, Riverside Church,
New York.

ALEXANDER M. DUSHKIN, Executive Di-
rector, Jewish Education Committee,
New York City.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

For list of members of this committee see the inside front cover.

Note: The officers and committee chairmen act as ex-officio members of each of
the standing committees.

Religious Education Association OFFICERS

Honorary President—George A. Coe, Professor (Retired), Evanston, Ill.

President—Harrison S. Elliott, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Vice-Presidents—Leo L. Honor, Director, Board of Jewish Education, Chicago; James S. Seneker, Southern Methodist University, Dallas; Erwin L. Shaver, Division of Christian Education of the Congregational and Christian Churches, Boston.

Treasurer—Weightstill Woods, Attorney, Chicago.

Recording Secretary—Ross W. Snyder, Professor, Chicago Theological Seminary.

Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board—Ernest J. Chave, Associate Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago.

CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Editorial—Frank M. McKibben, Professor of Religious Education, Northwestern University.

Central Planning Committee—Harrison S. Elliott.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Edna L. Acheson—Park Central Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, N.Y.

Morton M. Berman—Rabbi, Temple Isaiah Israel, Chicago.

W. Dyer Blair—International Council of Religious Education, New York office.

Edward W. Blakeman—Counselor in Religious Education, University of Michigan.

William C. Bower—Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago.

Adelaide Case—Professor of Religious Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Israel S. Chipkin—Associate Director, Jewish Education Committee, New York City.

Stewart G. Cole—Service Bureau for Intercultural Education, New York City.

Hedley S. Dimock, Dean, George Williams College, Chicago.

Alexander M. Dushkin—Executive Director, Jewish Education Committee, New York.

Miriam Ephraim—Educational Secretary, Y.M.H.A., Pittsburgh.

S. P. Franklin—School of Education, University of Pittsburgh.

Emanuel Gamoran—Educational Director, Commission on Jewish Education, Cincinnati.

Samuel H. Goldenson—Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El, New York City.

Samuel L. Hamilton—Professor of Education, New York University.

Hugh Hartshorne, Research Associate in Religion, Yale University.

Kenneth L. Heaton—Professor, Northwestern University.

C. Ivar Hellstrom—Minister of Education, Riverside Church, New York.

George Johnson—Professor of Education, Catholic University of America.

Philip C. Jones, Minister, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Ernest W. Kuehler—Secretary, Department of Religious Education, American Unitarian Association, Boston.

Isaac Landman—Director, Academy for Adult Jewish Education, New York City.

Paul Limbert—Professor, Y.M.C.A. College, Springfield, Mass.

Vergil E. Lowder—Minister, New First Congregational Church, Chicago.

E. R. MacLean—Director of Religious Education, United Church of Canada, Toronto.

Victor E. Marriott—Director of Religious Education, Chicago Congregational Union.

Otto Mayer—Director of Research, International Council of Religious Education, Chicago.

Rhoda McCulloch—Editor-in-Chief of Publications, National Board, Y.W.C.A., New York.

Raymond McLain, President, Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky.

Thornton W. Merriam—Director of Board of Religion, Northwestern University.

J. Quinter Miller—Field Secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

Alberta Munkres—Professor, Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa.

A. J. W. Myers—Professor, Religious Education, Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Ruth Shriver, Board of Education, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

H. Shelton Smith—Professor, Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

J. Edward Sproul—Program Executive, National Council of Y.M.C.A.'s, New York City.

Robert J. Taylor—Professor, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Thomas H. West—Attorney, Chicago.

Frank Wilson—Professor of Religion, Lincoln University, Pa.

Ray O. Wyland—Director of Education and Relationships, Boy Scouts of America, New York City.



DEC 15 '41W

INDEX
to
Volume XXXVI
of
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION
January, 1941
to
December, 1941

A

Administration of Religion in the Liberal Arts College: A Theory of Religious Integration, LEFTWICH, L. L.	234
Aims of the Public Elementary School, McSWAIN, E. T.	82
American High School Should Teach Democracy, EVERETT, SAMUEL	77
Annual Meeting of the Religious Education Ass'n	175
ANONYMOUS: I Graduate from Seminary: Comments by John G. Graig, Albert W. Palmer, James S. Chubb, Luther A. Weigle	163
An Apostle to the Diaspora, CHAVE, ERNEST J.	2

B

BLAKEMAN, EDWARD W., Developing an Indigenous Religious Program in a State University	67
Book Reviews and Notes	44-64, 121-128, 182-192, 248-256
BOWER, WILLIAM CLAYTON, Making the Resources of Religion Available in Education	3
BRADSHAW, EMERSON O., Eighty Hours More for Teaching Religion	220

C

CHAVE, ERNEST J., An Apostle to the Diaspora	2
Christian Education for Today, SHEEDER, FRANKLIN I.	13
CHUBB, JAMES S., I Graduate from Seminary—Comments	170
CLOWES, AMY, Religious Education Texts, Elementary Level	102
COE, GEORGE A., "Honoring Doctor Ames"	24
COLE, STEWART G., Intercultural Education	131
Comprehension Test on the Lord's Prayer, STUART, ROBERT	43
CRAIG, JOHN G., I Graduate from Seminary—Comments	166

D

DAY, NELLIE, Religious Education Texts, High School Level	107
Developing an Indigenous Religious Program in a State University, BLAKEMAN, EDWARD W.	67
DEXTER, LEWIS A., What We Do in Conferences	228
DIMOCK, HEDLEY S., Laboratories of Democracy	153

E

Education, Economics and Democracy: A Review, SANDERSON, ROSS W.	245
Eighty Hours More for Teaching Religion, BRADSHAW, EMERSON O.	220
ELLIOTT, HARRISON S., Religion in the Educational Experience of Children and Youth: A Syllabus	195
EMME, EARLE E., Factors in the Religious Development of Thirty-Eight College Students	116
EVERETT, SAMUEL, American High School Should Teach Democracy	77

F

Factors in the Religious Development of Thirty-Eight College Students, EMME, EARLE E.	116
Fellowship and Its Journal, HITES, LAIRD T.	130
FOX, G. GEORGE, Religious Education, but not in Public Schools	212
FREDERICK, ARTHUR L., Religion on the College Campus	145

H

HITES, LAIRD T., Fellowship and Its Journal, A.	130
HITES, LAIRD T., Plans for 1942	194
HITES, LAIRD T., Religion and Education—Preliminary Statement from the Annual Meeting	66
"Honoring Doctor Ames," COE, GEORGE A.	24
HUBBEN, WILLIAM, Religion at George School	20

I

I am a Conscientious Objector, PUTT, ROBERT MARSHALL.....	8
I Graduate from Seminary, ANONYMOUS.....	163
Intercultural Education, COLE, STEWART G.....	131

L

Laboratories of Democracy, DIMOCK, HEDLEY S.....	153
LEFTWICH, L. L., Administration of Religion in the Liberal Arts College: A Theory of Religious Integration.....	234

M

Making the Resources of Religion Available in Education, BOWER, WILLIAM CLAYTON.....	3
McSWAIN, E. T., Aims of the Public Elementary School.....	82

P

PALMER, ALBERT W., I Graduate from Seminary—Comments.....	168
Plans for 1942, HITES, LAIRD T.....	194
Progress in Building for Religious Education, TRALLE, HENRY EDWARD.....	28
PUTT, ROBERT MARSHALL, I Am a Conscientious Objector.....	8

R

Released Time in Chicago—a Panel Discussion.....	112
Religion and Education—Preliminary Statement from the Annual Meeting, HITES, LAIRD T.....	66
Religion at George School, HUBBEN, WILLIAM.....	20
Religion in the Educational Experience of Children and Youth: A Syllabus, ELLIOTT, HARRISON S.....	195
Religion in Elementary and Secondary Education—Some Lay Opinions, SEITZ, W. C.....	35
Religion on the College Campus, FREDERICK, ARTHUR L.....	145
Religious Education, but not in Public Schools, FOX, G. GEORGE.....	212
Religious Education in Quebec Public Schools, ROTHNEY, W. O.....	88
Religious Education Texts: Elementary Level, AMY CLOWES; High School Level, NELLIE DAY.....	102
ROTHNEY, W. O., Religious Education in Quebec Public Schools.....	88

S

SANDERSON, ROSS W., Education, Economics and Democracy: A Review.....	245
SEITZ, W. C., Religion in Elementary and Secondary Education—Some Lay Opinions.....	35
SHEEDER, FRANKLIN I., Christian Education for Today.....	13
STUART, ROBERT, Comprehension Test on the Lord's Prayer.....	43

T

TRALLE, HENRY EDWARD, Progress in Building for Religious Education.....	28
---	----

W

Weekday Religious Education, WOLCOTT, DOROTHEA K.....	94
WEIGLE, LUTHER A., I Graduate from Seminary—Comments.....	172
What We Do in Conferences, DEXTER, LEWIS A.....	228
WOLCOTT, DOROTHEA K., Weekday Religious Education.....	94



C51

0E2E □
1328
2E32
3235
4538
5E85
6368

1	1000
2	1000
3	1000
4	1000
5	1000
6	1000
7	1000
8	1000
9	1000
10	1000
11	1000
12	1000
13	1000
14	1000
15	1000
16	1000
17	1000
18	1000
19	1000
20	1000
21	1000
22	1000
23	1000
24	1000
25	1000
26	1000
27	1000
28	1000
29	1000
30	1000
31	1000
32	1000
33	1000
34	1000
35	1000
36	1000
37	1000
38	1000
39	1000
40	1000
41	1000
42	1000
43	1000
44	1000
45	1000
46	1000
47	1000
48	1000
49	1000
50	1000
51	1000
52	1000
53	1000
54	1000
55	1000
56	1000
57	1000
58	1000
59	1000
60	1000
61	1000
62	1000
63	1000
64	1000
65	1000
66	1000
67	1000
68	1000
69	1000
70	1000
71	1000
72	1000
73	1000
74	1000
75	1000
76	1000
77	1000
78	1000
79	1000
80	1000
81	1000
82	1000
83	1000
84	1000
85	1000
86	1000
87	1000
88	1000
89	1000
90	1000
91	1000
92	1000
93	1000
94	1000
95	1000
96	1000
97	1000
98	1000
99	1000

0E2E □
1328
2E32
3235
4538
5E85
6368

1	1000
2	1000
3	1000
4	1000
5	1000
6	1000
7	1000
8	1000
9	1000
10	1000
11	1000
12	1000
13	1000
14	1000
15	1000
16	1000
17	1000
18	1000
19	1000
20	1000
21	1000
22	1000
23	1000
24	1000
25	1000
26	1000
27	1000
28	1000
29	1000
30	1000
31	1000
32	1000
33	1000
34	1000
35	1000
36	1000
37	1000
38	1000
39	1000
40	1000
41	1000
42	1000
43	1000
44	1000
45	1000
46	1000
47	1000
48	1000
49	1000
50	1000
51	1000
52	1000
53	1000
54	1000
55	1000
56	1000
57	1000
58	1000
59	1000
60	1000
61	1000
62	1000
63	1000
64	1000
65	1000
66	1000
67	1000
68	1000
69	1000
70	1000
71	1000
72	1000
73	1000
74	1000
75	1000
76	1000
77	1000
78	1000
79	1000
80	1000
81	1000
82	1000
83	1000
84	1000
85	1000
86	1000
87	1000
88	1000
89	1000
90	1000
91	1000
92	1000
93	1000
94	1000
95	1000
96	1000
97	1000
98	1000
99	1000